STRATEGIC PLAN FOR FISCAL YEARS

2001-02 THROUGH 2005-06

OFFICE OF STATE EXAMINER
MUNICIPAL FIRE AND POLICE CIVIL SERVICE

JULY 1, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents (Continued)

STRATEGIC PLAN
OFFICE OF STATE EXAMINER
MUNICIPAL FIRE AND POLICE CIVIL SERVICE
FISCAL YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2005-06

VISION

The Office of State Examiner is committed to providing for the successful operation of the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service at the local level; building on a foundation of integrity, while seeking to inspire the confidence and trust of local governing officials, civil service boards, and employees in a system based upon merit, efficiency, fitness, and length of service.

MISSION

The mission of the Office of State Examiner, Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service, is to administer an effective, cost-efficient civil service system based on merit, efficiency, fitness, and length of service, consistent with the law and professional standards, for fire fighters and police officers in all municipalities in the State having populations of not less than 7,000 nor more than 400,000 inhabitants, and in all parish fire departments and fire protection districts regardless of population, in order to provide a continuity in quality of law enforcement and fire protection for the citizens of the State in rural and urban areas.

PHILOSOPHY

The citizens of Louisiana, and the dedicated fire fighters and police officers who protect them, are entitled to a municipal fire and police civil service system founded in fairness and integrity, and built on the concept of dedication and excellence of service.

GOALS

I. To develop and maintain validated classification plans in cooperation with the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Board in each jurisdiction which describe the grouping of like positions within the respective fire and police departments into classes which may be treated the same for all personnel purposes, the arrangement of which is designed to show the principal and natural lines of promotion and demotion, and which provide qualification requirements necessary for eligibility for admission to the respective examinations.

(Louisiana Revised Statutes, 33:2479(G)(1),(2),(5) and 33:2539(1),(2),(5))

II. To prepare and administer valid tests of fitness, developed according to professionally acceptable standards, for determining eligibility for initial appointment or promotion to classified positions in the respective fire and/or police departments of the municipalities and fire protection districts, score the tests and furnish the results to the local civil service boards for which the tests are given.

(Louisiana Revised Statutes, 33:2479(G)(1),(3) and 33:2539(1),(3))

III. To provide operational guidance in the legal requirements of the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System to the local civil service boards, governing and appointing authorities, department chiefs, employees of the classified fire and police services, and other local officers regarding the duties and obligations imposed upon them by civil service law and relevant State and Federal laws pertaining to the administration and management of personnel within the classified service.

(Louisiana Revised Statutes, 33:2479(G)(1),(4),(5),(6) and 33:2539(1),(4),(5),(6))

OBJECTIVES, STRATEGIES, AND RELATED PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

‘ **GOAL I:** **To develop and maintain validated classification plans in cooperation with the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Board in each jurisdiction which describe the grouping of like positions within the respective fire and police departments into classes which may be treated the same for all personnel purposes, the arrangement of which is designed to show the principal and natural lines of promotion and demotion, and which provide qualification requirements necessary for eligibility for admission to the respective examinations.**

OBJECTIVE I.1: To improve the content validity of classification plans for each jurisdiction by ensuring that each class description is supported by a recent job analysis (less than five years old) by June 30, 2006.

STRATEGY I.1.1 Review classification descriptions of all jurisdictions within the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System in order to identify those which are not supported by a job analysis less than five (5) years old, and/or which do not conform to the current recommendations of the Office of State Examiner.

STRATEGY I.1.2 Develop and maintain a database which targets class descriptions needing updating, and which will prompt future revisions so that they are completed within five years.

STRATEGY I.1.3 Conduct new job analyses for all classes not supported by job analysis data which is less than five (5) years old and make recommendations to local civil service boards on needed class plan changes.

STRATEGY I.1.4 Revise standard job analysis questionnaires for all classes to reflect current work methods in fire and police departments and to improve the quality of job analysis data gathered.

STRATEGY I.1.5 Develop validity documentation for qualification requirements recommended for all classes.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Total number of class descriptions.
Input: Number of class descriptions not supported by job analysis data less than five (5) years old.
Input: Number of standard job analysis questionnaires (27).
Output: Number of new job analyses conducted to provide documentary support of class descriptions.
Outcome: Percent of class descriptions meeting the criteria of having job analysis support less than five (5) years old.
Outcome: Percent of class descriptions with qualification requirements supported by appropriate validity documentation.
Outcome: Percent of standard job analysis questionnaires revised.

OBJECTIVE I.2: By June 30, 2006, improve efficiency of service to local civil service boards by providing timely recommendations to civil service boards on needed class plan changes following all job analyses within 90 days of receipt of job analysis information, and by providing updated class descriptions on changes adopted by boards within fourteen days of receiving minutes of meeting.

STRATEGY I.2.1 Develop and maintain an integrated database which will provide targets for completion of needed class plan revisions at the time the job analysis data is received and minutes are reviewed.

STRATEGY I.2.2 Cross train professional personnel so that more manpower will be available for developing class plans when peak periods of activity are experienced.

STRATEGY I.2.3 Provide classification personnel with timely access to board minutes reported to the Office of State Examiner by scanning minutes into database to be developed for this purpose.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of class descriptions identified requiring revision following receipt of recent job analysis information.
Output: Number of class description recommendations made to local civil service boards.
Outcome and Efficiency:
Average number of days between date of receipt of job analysis data and date of recommendation on class plan change to civil service board.
Outcome and Efficiency:

Average number of days between receipt of minutes of board meeting identifying changes adopted to class plan and date on which completed revisions are forwarded to civil service board.

‘ **GOAL II:** **To prepare and administer valid tests of fitness, developed according to professionally acceptable standards, for determining eligibility for initial appointment or promotion to classified positions in the respective fire and/or police departments of the municipalities and fire protection districts, score the tests and furnish the results to the local civil service boards for which the tests are given.**

OBJECTIVE II.1: By June 30, 2006, improve the validity of examinations developed by the Office of State Examiner so that candidates identified as eligible will have the knowledge and skills necessary to be placed in working test period, and so that examinations administered will be legally defensible.

STRATEGY II.1.1 Incorporate low fidelity, job simulation testing at the ranks of Deputy Police Chief, Assistant Police Chief, Police Major, and Police Captain in the police service, and Deputy Fire Chief, Assistant Fire Chief, and District Fire Chief in the fire service.

STRATEGY II.1.2 Develop documentary support for the use of scores for ranking purposes on standard, multi-jurisdictional promotional examinations through input of experts in the fire and police services.

STRATEGY II.1.3 Identify jurisdictions and classes where testing of local operating procedures is needed, enter into agreement with local officials to provide updated procedures on an ongoing basis, and structure examinations to meet new exam plan criteria.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input:	Number of multi-jurisdictional promotional examinations.
Outcome:	Percent of standard promotional examinations for which documentary support for score ranking has been established.
Input:	Number of classes targeted for low fidelity, job simulation testing.
Outcome:	Number of examination levels for which low fidelity job simulation testing has been developed.

Input: Number of requests for development of local test material.

Output: Number of tests utilizing the development of local test material.

Outcome & Efficiency:

Number of challenges to where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity such as the Department of Justice or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has found that an examination, developed and administered by the OSE was not appropriate. (The standard to which we aspire is to have 0 decisions finding fault with our examinations.)

OBJECTIVE II.2: To continue providing examination scores to local civil service boards within 120 days from receipt of exam request despite an anticipated 50% increase in number of jurisdictions to which the system will apply by June 30, 2006.

STRATEGY II.2.1 Develop relational database computer application to assist in moving examinations through the developmental and grading process in a timely manner.

STRATEGY II.2.2 Increase efficiency of staff by cross training on key functions such as grade, analysis and report preparation.

STRATEGY II.2.3 Improve features of custom test generation software to eliminate much of the word processing work required to produce examinations, study guides, and reports.

STRATEGY II.2.4 Add one Human Resources Program Consultant to table of organization by July 1, 2003.

STRATEGY II.2.5 Add an additional Human Resources Program Consultant to table of organization by July 1, 2004.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of examination requests

Outcome & Efficiency:

Number of days from date of examination request to date scores are mailed.

OBJECTIVE II.3: By June 30, 2006, to complete a major analysis of all Fire Prevention and Fire Investigation classes statewide (approximately 12 class titles) and develop standard, multi-jurisdictional examinations for use in as many levels statewide as possible.

STRATEGY II.3.1 Conduct job analysis of all Fire Prevention classes in jurisdictions statewide, including the classes of Fire Inspector, Fire Investigator, Fire Prevention Officer, and promotional classes within the series. Identify classes which may be grouped together for testing purposes.

STRATEGY II.3.2 Work cooperatively with the Fire Science officials at LSU-Eunice and with the LSU Fire and Emergency Rescue officials in Baton Rouge to structure exam plans consistent with NFPA standards and local job analysis data.

STRATEGY II.3.3 Develop standard examinations and supporting validation documentation as needed so that all Fire Prevention classes have newly constructed, content-valid examinations.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of Fire Prevention classes targeted for multi-jurisdictional test development.

Output: Number of Fire Prevention validation projects completed.

Outcome & Efficiency:

Number of challenges where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity such as the Department of Justice or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has found that an examination in the Fire Prevention series was not appropriate. (The standard to which we aspire is to have 0 decisions finding fault with our examinations.)

OBJECTIVE II.4: Improve quality of examinations and efficiency of exam preparation by conducting a comprehensive review and update of all 11,000+ test questions in OSE database from which tests are drawn by June 30, 2006.

STRATEGY II.4.1 Provide training to five members of the professional staff each year (on a rotating basis) in the principles of item writing and test validation methodology through the International Personnel Management Association Assessment Council. Encourage employees to obtain professional certification through this organization.

STRATEGY II.4.2 Conduct initial review of item bank to remove outdated items which cannot be sourced to recognized text, or which do not perform as expected in measuring job knowledge.

STRATEGY II.4.3 Convert item bank from DOS format to Windows format.

STRATEGY II.4.4 Improve integration of grading and test construction software programs by providing for data on item performance to be automatically posted following the administration of each examination.

STRATEGY II.4.5 Revise test questions in item bank, as necessary, to comply with agency and technical standards for item construction.

STRATEGY II.4.6 Develop new test questions, as necessary, to provide a sufficient database from which job knowledge in specific classes may be evaluated.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of test questions in item bank.

Output: Number of test items reviewed and removed from item bank.

Output: Number of test items updated or revised.

Output: Number of test items researched and sourced to new reference edition.

Output: Number of new test items written to satisfy requirements of examination plans.

Outcome & Efficiency:
Number of test questions which must be removed during the grading process due to problems with item construction or source.

‘ **GOAL III. To provide operational guidance in the legal requirements of the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System to the local civil service boards, governing and appointing authorities, department chiefs, employees of the classified fire and police services, and other local officers regarding the duties and obligations imposed upon them by civil service law and relevant State and Federal laws pertaining to the administration and management of personnel within the classified service.**

OBJECTIVE III.1: To provide initial orientation by June 30, 2006, to local governing authorities in 27 new jurisdictions to which the system applies concerning the requirements of Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Law, and assisting such entities in establishing civil service boards.

STRATEGY III.1.1 Establish initial contact with local officials (mayors, fire board of commissioners, department chiefs) of potential jurisdictions to determine if criteria for inclusion in the system has been met, and offer advice and assistance on the provisions of the

Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service system.

STRATEGY III.1.2 Establish database tracking system with specific follow-up dates for contacts with potential jurisdictions.

STRATEGY III.1.3 Attend meetings in local areas as may be necessary in order to explain the process of establishing civil service system and answer questions and concerns.

STRATEGY III.1.4 Provide technical support as needed over the phone and by correspondence.

STRATEGY III.1.5 Establish a working relationship with the Office of Attorney General in order to encourage potential jurisdictions required be in the system to comply with the provisions of civil service law.

STRATEGY III.1.6 Swear in new civil service boards and provide initial training in the functions and responsibilities of the civil service board.

STRATEGY III.1.7 Add one Human Resources Program Consultant Supervisor position in the Personnel Management Division and one Executive Secretary position to OSE table of organization by July 1, 2003.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input: Number of potential jurisdictions identified as meeting the criteria for establishing a civil service system.

Output: Number of potential jurisdictions with whom initial orientation has been completed.

Outcome: Percentage of jurisdictions identified as meeting applicability requirements for inclusion in system for whom initial orientation has been completed.

Outcome & Efficiency:
Number of new jurisdictions added for whom boards have been sworn in.

OBJECTIVE III.2: To improve service to jurisdictions through timely support to those involved in the operation of the system at the local level through telephone support, correspondence, seminars, individual orientation sessions, and revised training materials with interactive components by June 30, 2006.

STRATEGY III.2.1 Develop and distribute a new training manual specifically designed for appointing/governing authorities.

STRATEGY III.2.2 Provide telephone support to individuals with operational questions about the system by responding to questions within twenty-four hours.

STRATEGY III.2.3 Provide each board member and board secretary with an operations manual and accompanying interactive CD-rom which serves as a reference for the proper completion of various forms, including personnel action forms, posting notices, and subpoenas.

STRATEGY III.2.4 Provide written guidance as requested by responding to all written inquiries within twenty-one days.

STRATEGY III.2.5 Conduct training seminars in the operation of the system and relevant personnel matters for appointing authorities or their designees, Fire and Police Chiefs, civil service boards, and board and chief's secretaries.

STRATEGY III.2.6 Publish newsletter at least once a year on legal changes impacting the system, services available through the Office of State Examiner and frequently asked questions.

STRATEGY III.2.7 Review minutes of all civil service board meetings reported to the Office of State Examiner in order to offer timely advice on the operation of the system in accordance with civil service law.

STRATEGY III.2.8 Provide supporting information (civil service law, classification plans, board rules, and operations manuals in a searchable CD-rom format to each civil service board and department chief.

STRATEGY III.2.9 Speak to state conferences of employee groups, chief's associations, and associations of appointing authorities when requested.

STRATEGY III.2.10 Track legislation pertinent to the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service system in order to provide information as requested to persons with a vested interest in the operation of the system.

STRATEGY III.2.11 Conduct a salary survey of all jurisdictions within the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service system, and make results available to all jurisdictions and interested parties.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Input: Number of telephone inquiries received.

Efficiency: Percent of telephone inquiries handled within twenty-four hours.

Input: Number of written requests for guidance.

Efficiency:	Percent of written requests for guidance handled within twenty-one days.
Input:	Number of civil service minutes reviewed.
Output:	Number of newsletters published per year.
Outcome:	Number of individuals trained through seminars or individual orientation.
Quality:	Percentage of seminar attendees rating training as informative and helpful.

OBJECTIVE III.3: To reduce the percentage of Personnel Action Forms (PAFs) which must be returned to local jurisdictions to 4.00% by June 30, 2006, through training of local personnel and interactive computer based tutorial to facilitate correct personnel actions.

STRATEGY III.3.1 Review all personnel action forms reported by local civil service board and enter into agency database.

STRATEGY III.3.2 When personnel actions are not made in accordance with the law, return PAFs reporting such to the local civil service board along with a written explanation of the problem.

STRATEGY III.3.3 Develop interactive personnel action forms to be made available with training manuals and on agency web site to facilitate reporting and improve accuracy of entries.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input:	Number of personnel action forms received.
Output:	Number of personnel action forms reviewed for compliance with civil service law.
Outcome:	Number of personnel action forms returned to jurisdictions for correction.
Efficiency:	Total number of PAFs returned divided by total received.

OBJECTIVE III.4: To increase service to jurisdictions and to applicants for employment in the system through the e-government concept by adding online, interactive services in ten (10) areas by June 30, 2006.

STRATEGY III.4.1 Provide a searchable database for answers to frequently asked questions.

STRATEGY III.4.2 Post qualification requirements for Firefighter, Police Officer, Fire Chief and Police Chief for each jurisdiction under the listing for that civil service jurisdiction.

STRATEGY III.4.3 Provide summaries of Attorney General Opinions relevant to the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service.

STRATEGY III.4.4	Provide summaries of Appellate and Supreme Court decisions relevant to the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service.
STRATEGY III.4.5	Provide a link to the Louisiana Revised Statutes.
STRATEGY III.4.6	Provide an interactive personnel action form to assist in completing reports on appointments, promotions, and other personnel actions.
STRATEGY III.4.7	Establish a statewide registry for persons interested in Firefighter and Police Officer job opportunities in other jurisdictions.
STRATEGY III.4.8	Provide a virtual office for each civil service board where boards can access their class plans, rules, personnel records, etc.
STRATEGY III.4.9	Provide fill-in-the-blank forms, such as posting notices, subpoenas, seniority rosters, etc., that can be completed online.
STRATEGY III.4.10	Provide links to other internet sites related to the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Input:	Number of informational categories on agency website.
Output:	Number of new informational categories added to website.
Output:	Number of visitors (hits) to website.
Outcome:	Percent increase in informational categories on website.

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF STATE EXAMINER
DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2005-06

SITUATION INVENTORY

Who are the customers/clients, other stakeholders, and expectation groups for the Office of State Examiner?

CUSTOMERS

Customers of government are defined to include anyone who receives or uses the services of a government program or whose success or satisfaction depends upon the actions of a department, office, institution, or program.

The customers of the Office of State Examiner are the members of the local Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Boards, the classified employees within the system, the departmental chiefs and governing authorities, those candidates seeking employment in the classified service, and those individuals seeking information about the operation of the system. The interests of the respective customers will be discussed separately.

The members of the local Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Boards, who serve without compensation and who usually lack a background or training in personnel administration, as well as the civil service board secretaries, depend heavily upon the Office of State Examiner (OSE) in the execution of their duties. The OSE works closely with the board members in analyzing positions and allocating them to their rightful place within the classified service, developing and maintaining classification plans, and providing advice on how to conduct meetings and hearings in accordance with State law. At the request of the local board, the OSE develops and administers tests of original entrance and promotion, then furnishes the results to the local board. The OSE also assists the civil service boards in determining if appointments and promotions are made in accordance with civil service law. The assistance and training provided to civil service board members is a continuous process, as board membership changes on a regular basis. The terms of office for civil service board members are for three years, with the terms of the respective appointees expiring on a staggered basis in each jurisdiction.

The classified employees of the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service depend upon the OSE to ensure that the system functions in the manner in which it was created: to provide a structured, competitive merit system; continuous employment during changes of local government administration, a system of equal pay for equal work, a method through which an employee may seek relief if he feels he has been subjected to discrimination in employment practices or working conditions, as well as relief from unfair disciplinary or corrective actions. The classified employees depend upon the OSE to provide promotional tests that are fair and job related, and to also provide feedback on examination performance so that future study efforts might be guided accordingly. Classified employees also turn to the Office of State Examiner when questions arise about the operation of the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service system.

The departmental chiefs and governing authorities depend upon the OSE, through the use of validated employment examinations, to provide the local civil service boards with lists of candidates for entrance and promotion who have a reasonable expectation of success in the working test period. The local officials use the group analyses of exam performance provided by this office in analyzing the effectiveness of and guiding departmental training efforts. The departmental chiefs and governing authorities are provided an orderly and efficient system of personnel administration. The departmental chiefs and governing authorities also depend upon the OSE for advice and guidance on the procedures to be followed when disciplining or terminating employees. The OSE works closely with local officials in scheduling examinations so that public safety manpower staffing levels are not compromised during the examination process. The OSE also identifies and provides initial orientation and key support to new jurisdictions entering the system.

Those candidates seeking employment in the classified service depend upon the OSE to develop and utilize tests that are fair and job related, to provide information on locations where upcoming examinations are being administered, and to provide guidance on the process for reporting their scores to jurisdictions other than where they tested, but where employment opportunities might be available or desired.

The final type of customer for the OSE are the individuals seeking records or information of a public nature under the public records statutes. These individuals have an expectation that those records that fall within the public domain will be made available within a reasonable amount of time.

STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are defined as groups or individuals who have a vested interest in the organization.

The stakeholders of the Office of State Examiner include those entities previously identified as customers, as well as employee associations, municipal or civic associations, the citizens of the communities served by the various fire and police departments, and fire and police training facilities. The benefits to the community include professional employees who are employed and promoted on the basis of skills and professional abilities, thus responding to the primary need of public safety in the area. The overall program is geared to provide an equitable employment situation for employees and potential employees within the system, with the end result being greater efficiency within the departments, increased professionalism of employees, improved law enforcement and fire protection within the communities, and sustained higher employee morale.

EXPECTATION GROUPS

Expectation groups are defined as those entities which expect certain levels of performance or compliance but do not receive services from an organization.

The expectation groups associated with the Office of State Examiner include the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Department of Justice, the Legislature, and any court before which the operations of the Office of State Examiner may be reviewed.

The Office of State Examiner is expected to use professionally acceptable standards in conducting job analyses, developing classification plans, and validating examinations that are used as part of the selection process in the respective jurisdictions. The standards by which these activities are reviewed are found in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, adopted by four Federal agencies in 1978. In addition, the EEOC also oversees provisions of the Americans With Disabilities Act which pertain to hiring and employment practices.

What services are provided by the Office of State Examiner?

S Testing for entrance and promotion in the respective jurisdictions.
S Lists of eligibles furnished to local civil service boards.
S Study guides and pre-examination booklets.
Individual and group analyses.
S 24-hour access phone number for information on firefighter and police officer tests.
S Development of classification plans and assistance to the local boards in allocating positions to the appropriate classifications.
S Review of roll calls furnished by local civil service boards for promotional examinations for eligibility of reported individuals according to established board rules.

- S Assistance to local civil service boards, governing authorities and employees within the system on the operation of the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service.
- S Seminars for local boards, governing officials, and board secretaries.
- S Review of appropriateness of all personnel actions.
- S Maintenance of files on all employees within the system.
- S Maintenance of web site with frequently requested information.
- S Competitive and promotional application forms.
- S Newsletter of topics pertinent to those served by this office.

What is the authority of the Office of State Examiner in providing the services identified above?

Article X, Section 16 of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974, and other provisions of the Constitution of 1921, Article 14, § 15.1 not specifically mentioned in R.S. 33:2471 et seq.
Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:2471 through 2508.
Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:2531 through 2568.
Louisiana Revised Statute 33:2591.

What is the history of the operation of the Office of State Examiner, Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service, and what is the current status of the organization?

Historical Perspective - Office of State Examiner

1934 - Act 22 of the Second Extraordinary Session of 1934 created a State Civil Service Commission composed of the following: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House of Representatives, State Superintendent of Public Education, Attorney General, Secretary of State, and the Superintendent of the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation. The Commission was given the power to investigate the heads of all municipal police and fire departments, except those elected by direct vote of the people and to "require of them proof of their competence to hold such position." The Commission was given the power to remove such head if he was found to be incompetent, as well as the power to pass on all new heads. Members of the police and fire departments could be dismissed by the department head, but his action was subject to review by the Commission. The Commission could also suspend members of the force on its own initiative or, after inquiry or hearing, compel a person's dismissal.

1940 - Act 253 of 1940 created the Municipal Fire and Police Law which applied to cities with populations from 16,000 to 100,000. The six original cities in the system were Alexandria, Baton Rouge, Lafayette, Lake Charles, Monroe, and Shreveport. Act 253 created a five member civil service commission in each city, and also created the office of State Civil Service Examiner to be appointed by the governor with the consent of the Senate. The Municipal Fire and Police Law provided that seniority should be the basis for all promotions, as well as for reductions in force. The Department of Civil Service temporarily administered the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System from 1940 to 1944.

1942 - The population minimum for inclusion in the system was lowered from 16,000 to 13,000, thus including the cities of New Iberia and Bogalusa. In 1942 the system covered 575 classified fire fighters and 500 police officers.

1944 - The Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service was officially separated from State Civil Service on July 27, 1944, by Act 102 of 1944.

1948 - The upper population limit for inclusion in the system was changed from 100,000 to 250,000.

1952 - Act 302 of 1952 incorporated the Fire and Police Civil Service into the Constitution of 1921 by amendment. Following passage by the Legislature, the amendment was approved by the voters in November 1952.

1964 - Act 282 of 1964 broadened the scope of applicability to municipalities with populations of 7,000 to 13,000, and included all fire protection districts.

1970 - Act 643 of 1970 created a classified fire and police civil service in all municipalities having a population between 250,000 and 500,000.

1974 - Article X, Section 16 of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974 provided for the establishment of a system of classified fire and police civil service in municipalities with populations exceeding 13,000, and in all fire protection districts operating a regularly paid fire department. Section 17 provided that permanent appointments shall be made only after certification by the applicable municipal fire and police civil service board under a general system based upon merit, efficiency, fitness, and length of service as provided in Article XIV, Section 15.1 of the Constitution of 1920, subject to change by law enacted by two-thirds of the elected members of each house of the legislature. Section 18 provided that "Except as inconsistent with this Part, the provisions of Article XIV , Section 15.1 of the Constitution of 1921 are retained and continued in force and effect as statutes." The applicable statutes are Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:2471 et seq., and 33:2531 et seq.

1992 - Act 497 of 1992 amended and reenacted Louisiana R.S. 22:1419(A), relative to dedications of the Insurance Rating Commission Expense fund to create the Municipal Fire and Police Civil

Service Operating Fund in the state treasury by dedicating 2/100 of 1 percent of gross insurance premiums for the operation of the Office of State Examiner.

1999 - Act 931 of 1999 further amended R.S. 22:1419(A)(2) to provide for increased dedications of the Insurance Rating Commission Expense fund to the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Operating Fund in the amounts of 2.25 1/100ths for premiums paid in 1998, 2.37 1/100ths by 2001, and 2.5 1/100ths by 2003 and every year thereafter.

FISCAL YEAR	NO. OF JURISDICTIONS	NO. OF CANDIDATES EXAMINED	NO. OF EMPLOYEES IN SYSTEM	OSE STAFF
1974-75	48	3,720	4,245	20
1980-81	52	5,480	5,183	19
1981-82	55	5,320	5,450	19
1982-83	55	7,741	5,550	19
1983-84	55	6,615	5,850	19
1984-85	56	6,593	6,000	16
1985-86	58	8,531	6,100	15
1986-87	63	6,318	5,990	12.75
1987-88	64	7,216	6,175	13
1988-89	68	7,456	6,073	12
1989-90	71	6,777	6,137	12
1990-91	73	6,940	6,407	12
1991-92	76	7,533	6,453	14
1992-93	82	5,835	6,552	14
1993-94	84	6,395	6,668	14
1994-95	88	6,074	6,868	15
1995-96	90	6,523	7,036	15
1996-97	92	6,448	7,306	15
1997-98	93	5,765	7,404	17

FISCAL YEAR	NO. OF JURISDICTIONS	NO. OF CANDIDATES EXAMINED	NO. OF EMPLOYEES IN SYSTEM	OSE STAFF
1998-99	96	6,250	7,434	17
1999-00	96	6,129	7,647	17
2000-01	96	6,394	7,797	17

Current Status of the Office of State Examiner, Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service

There are 96 jurisdictions currently served by the Office of State Examiner in 39 parishes throughout the State. As of June 30, 2001, there were 7,797 classified employees within the system. For a list of jurisdictions with the number of employees, please refer to Appendix D. The table of organization for the Office of State Examiner contains 17 employees, all of whom are in the classified service (see Appendix E For a current organizational chart).

Duplication of Effort

The Department of State Civil Service and the State Police Commission serve different constituent groups than does the Office of State Examiner, and under different legal authority. While all entities provide civil service examinations and eligibility lists, the Office of State Examiner works exclusively with *local* governing authorities and civil service boards. The Office of State Examiner also must accommodate and adapt to the rule making ability of civil service boards in *each* jurisdiction served by the agency, rather than working under a standard set of rules adopted by one board. Each jurisdiction has its own classification plan, and tests administered by the Office of State Examiner must reflect the requirements of the job as it exists locally. This would be similar to the Department of State Civil Service having to conduct independent job analyses and develop separate examinations appropriate for Administrative Specialist positions in each state agency utilizing that class. The Office of State Examiner also has a different test validation requirement than do the other civil service entities because of the uses and applications made of the test scores according to State law. The Office of State Examiner has no responsibility for recruitment, as do the other entities, in that the local civil service boards in the system bear this responsibility.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN – INTERNAL FACTORS

What are the current and projected internal factors that may have an impact on the operations of the Office of State Examiner over the next five years?

1. Chronic Staffing Problems.

The Office of State Examiner currently has seventeen (17) authorized positions, including only two (2) clerical positions. This staffing level is inadequate to meet the workload demands required of this office by the constitution and statutes. Our budget requests have repeatedly articulated this need, including detailed supporting documentation on required manpower to function at a continuation level, yet we have been unsuccessful during the past five budget cycles in convincing the Office of Planning and Budget of our needs. The manpower staffing analysis contained in our FY 2001-02 budget request indicated an employee deficit of 425 days, or 1.86 additional employees needed for the budget year. This problem will become progressively worse as new jurisdictions are added fairly rapidly during the next few years. (Note: This problem will be discussed in detail under the section for "external factors.") This problem is particularly frustrating in that sufficient funds are available to adequately meet existing staffing requests in the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Operating Fund *without* any use of State General Funds.

Exacerbating the chronic staffing shortage are a difficulty in filling vacancies, the number of employees eligible for retirement, a relatively high turnover rate, and employee morale. We have looked at each of these problems as objectively as possible, and offer the following analysis:

Difficulty filling job vacancies: Despite the existence of a hiring freeze in 2000, we made the difficult decision to terminate three employees serving in probationary "working tests" during that year. We place a high emphasis on making good hiring decisions, and make such decisions with the long term ability of the OSE to fulfill its mission in mind. We were granted an exemption to the hiring freeze, yet the problem of insufficient qualified eligibles on the PET list who met our requirements continued to plague our efforts. Through the process of exploring other recruitment efforts, we established contact with the Psychology Department of Southern University. Dr. Muriel Harrison worked closely with us in providing access to graduates and graduating seniors in their program. As a result of this relationship, we attended their career day for the first time this year, and were also asked to serve as a training facility for psychology interns who seek actual work experience in their chosen field prior to graduation.

We have also had difficulty hiring and training qualified employees for our two clerical positions.

The positions are targeted for reallocation requests due to the confidential and highly technical nature of work inherent in the two jobs.

Employees eligible for retirement: Three employees of the Office of State Examiner are eligible for retirement during the next two years. While this appears to be a hefty 18% of our staff, the problem is magnified with the understanding that these three employees represent 48.9% of the combined agency experience. Their retirement will reduce the current average agency experience from 11 years to fewer than 7 years. All three occupy key positions: one employee with 36 years of experience is our most experienced journeyman level employee in the Testing Division, one employee with 29 years of experience is our Assistant Test Development Manager, and one employee with 30 years of experience handles all accounting and human resources functions for the agency.

High turnover: One factor in analyzing turnover must be the relatively high employment rate we have experienced in the Baton Rouge area over the last few years. It is difficult to hire and retain qualified employees if the pay we are able to offer is not competitive with the private industry. It is also difficult for a small agency to appear competitive with the larger ones when attracting entry-level employees who have real issues concerning opportunities for career advancement. A second factor is the very high volume of work our employees must produce in order for the OSE to meet its goals in a timely manner. Chronic staffing shortages have forced the agency into paying time and a half overtime inasmuch we cannot afford to lose the valuable hours lost due to compensatory time. This is an adequate short-term solution, but the problem is not defined by peak periods during the year. Our staffing shortage is an ongoing problem throughout the year. As will be discussed below, low employee morale and increased health problems result when employees are not afforded adequate "off" time.

Employee morale: A high workload with relatively little chance for career advancement in the foreseeable future are factors which contribute to employee morale not being as high as we would like. This has been an area we have worked very hard to improve over the last one and one-half years. Steps we have taken to mitigate the effects of those things we cannot change include the acquisition of ergonomically designed furniture, office reorganization and reallocation of key positions to levels commensurate with responsibility, a demonstrated commitment to training that provides necessary tools to accomplish job duties, and a change in the office culture and policies to become more "family friendly" in allowing greater flexibility in work schedules. The inclusive, participatory management style of the current State Examiner has also encouraged growth and professional development among all employees, a factor which has impacted positively on the overall morale of the agency.

2. Relocation of Office

The Office of State Examiner has recently been informed that our lease in the Louisiana Retirements

Systems Building will not be renewed upon its expiration at the end of June 2002. In considering available alternatives, we must focus on our accessibility to our clients (most of whom are from out of town), the security of our examination materials, and the safety of our employees. It is our desire to remain near our current location off of Essen near the I-10/I-12 split in an area that is accessible to our client groups traveling from all locations throughout the State. We also have employees traveling throughout the State to administer examinations who return between 5:00 and 10:00 p.m. most days of the week. Their safety, and the security of our examinations in parked vehicles, is a primary concern.

Significant time will be required to locate suitable office space and to complete the logistical requirements of the move including preparing scale floor plans and securing lease. Additional expenses will be incurred to secure movers, to install computer network cabling and telephone lines, to move the video surveillance security system, and to reprint stationary and notify clients of the address change. From prior experience, we anticipate a significant loss of productivity for a period of about six weeks surrounding the move.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN – EXTERNAL FACTORS

What are the current and projected external factors or issues that may have an impact on the operations of the Office of State Examiner over the next five years?

1. A projected 50% increase in the number of jurisdictions to which the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Law applies.

Jurisdictions are required by law to enter the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service when one of two conditions is met: In the case of a municipality, the system becomes applicable when the city operates a paid fire or police department, and when the population reaches 7,000 or over as a result of the last decennial census. The 2000 Census identified three additional municipalities to which the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System will apply. In the case of a fire protection district, the system becomes applicable when a volunteer department hires at least one regularly paid employee having as a primary responsibility one of the duties identified under Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:2541 (A).

While there have been occasions when this *has* occurred, we generally do not have chiefs of small departments knocking on our door and asking for services from our office. Many are not aware of the requirements or applicability of the system. The Office of State Examiner, therefore, sees an obligation to identify those entities to which the system applies and offer essential guidance to local governing authorities in assisting them with compliance with the provisions of this law.

The research involved in identifying new jurisdictions has traditionally been very extensive and time consuming. The decennial census has always been a logical tool to use in identifying new municipalities, although identifying new paid fire departments was often dependent upon word-of-mouth reports. While we have researched supplemental pay records, one of the problems encountered is that the department may use a name that is misleading. An example would be those departments which use the name of a small town as the name of the fire department. The population of the town might be well below the required 7,000 inhabitants (thus making the system not applicable to a *municipal* fire department), but a close examination of the organization of the department may indicate that it is, in fact, a parish fire protection district that would denote applicability of our system.

The recent advent of internet capabilities within our office, as well as resources made available through other state agency websites such as that of the State Fire Marshal, have given this office the opportunity to identify new jurisdictions with a higher degree of certainty. We have identified 27 additional jurisdictions as definitely meeting the criteria for inclusion in our system, and have an additional list of 42 jurisdictions currently requiring further research. It is conservatively projected that approximately half of the additional 42 jurisdictions will meet system applicability criteria. This represents an increase of 48 new jurisdictions or an increase of 50% over our current workload.

The crisis this presents is that the Office of State Examiner has a legal obligation to contact and provide services to a client base that is 50% larger than what we currently serve. We are currently struggling with chronic manpower shortages for our existing workload, and it would be irresponsible to establish contact with jurisdictions and advise them of system applicability, then not be able to follow through with the required services. It is essential that we increase the size of our staff to accommodate our dramatic growth in jurisdictions, yet still provide services at a continuation level to existing jurisdictions. Our plan for accommodating this growth is to add two additional Human Resources Program Consultants, one Human Resources Program Consultant Supervisor, and one Executive Secretary. Resources will be devoted initially to the intensive effort and support needed to assimilate and provide operational training to the new jurisdictions (Personnel Management Division), and will be gradually shifted to the Testing Division as the workload shifts to that function once the local systems are operational.

An additional problem with bringing new jurisdictions onboard is that the Office of State Examiner has no legal means of forcing compliance with the provisions of the law. The system is mandatory for those departments meeting eligibility criteria, and the Attorney General has opined that jurisdictions may not simply choose not to be included. It is our intention to establish contact with the Office of the Attorney General in this regard to discuss appropriate methods for requiring compliance.

2. The desire for reform of current civil service provisions.

There are many proponents for change in the system who make convincing arguments that the current legal requirement for promoting the eligible with the greatest total department seniority encourages mediocrity and decreases departmental effectiveness. This position is held primarily by the department administrators and governing authorities. Employee groups, on the other hand, are nervous that changes to the promotional scheme will open the door to political patronage and roadblocks to career advancement for officers who are qualified, yet not in a favored group. The Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Law was initially enacted in 1940 to eliminate such favoritism not based on merit factors. The argument has been hotly debated before legislative committees, with both sides offering differing views of what constitutes a "merit system."

The Office of State Examiner desires to facilitate discussions between the two client groups in a non-contentious atmosphere that will allow common ground to be explored between the opposing sides of the argument for reform. The essential element is that both parties desire efficiency and safety in the fire and police services. The challenge is finding personnel management tools which will move the system forward while remaining sensitive to the needs and concerns of career fire and police professionals. The State Examiner has been invited to speak before state conventions for both the Professional Firefighters of Louisiana and the Louisiana Police Chiefs' Association, as well as meet with members of the respective groups to discuss the opportunities for change in the system.

The challenge facing the Office of State Examiner is that we must be prepared to move in whatever direction is provided by the Legislature regarding civil service reform. Tests are validated for specific uses, and our tests are currently validated for use on a pass/fail basis as is required by our existing law. Additional documentation is needed and different test formats might be appropriate if the system moves to promoting on the basis of test scores.

3. Utilization of e-government techniques and technological advances.

The Office of State Examiner embraces the progressive mission of the State of Louisiana to provide "world-class government services" to its citizens and others through the effective use of technology. As we move forward into the twenty-first century, the Office of State Examiner will endeavor to anticipate and respond to the needs of those whom we serve through the use of the Internet and the agency's presence on the world wide web. The agency has become a resource of instant support and information in matters related to the fire and police classified service, and we will continue to search for ways which will improve accessibility and expand the availability of information. The following is a representation of concepts which are currently being evaluated and developed:

1. A registry of entry-level police officer and firefighter applicants willing to be considered for employment in municipalities and fire protection districts included in the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System. This database will provide the names of persons who have received passing scores on the competitive entrance police officer or firefighter examinations, and whose scores have been certified by the appropriate civil service board. The registry will include a brief resume of the applicant, and will be accessible by password

to fire chiefs, police chiefs, and appointing authorities over a secure connection for recruiting purposes.

2. Eligibility lists which are accessible by civil service boards, and which are password protected over a secure connection.

3. An initial point of contact for research into subject matter related to the employment and personnel administration of the classified fire and police service. Information which will be made available will include applicable Case Law (Federal and State court decisions), Attorney General Opinions, Ethics Board Rulings and Opinions, and relevant Louisiana Revised Statutes which are not civil service law, but which address certain provisions applicable to employees of the fire and police services.

4. A site where interested persons may obtain answers to questions of a general nature and which are frequently asked of the Office of State Examiner.

The Office of State Examiner also recognizes, as the result of Act 1467 of 1997, that the Louisiana Legislature and the Division of Administration, Office of Planning and Budget are also clients of the agency, inasmuch as the act mandates performance-based budgeting. The ***Louisiana Government Performance and Accountability Act*** requires, among other things, that agencies perform strategic planning, operational planning, performance accountability, and performance reporting. When the Office of State Examiner began implementing the provisions of the Act, the agency utilized computer software applications considered sufficient for the time, but which also required a significant allocation of personnel resources in order to maintain. Because technology has outpaced the agency's fiscal ability to acquire or develop a more efficient means of workload tracking, we have been forced to continue using software which has now become obsolete and inefficient. We are now in a position in which we must redesign and update our workload tracking system to an integrated database, which will enable the agency to maintain performance information with minimal dependence on personnel resources, and which will allow more accurate and effective workload planning and management.

4. Increase in the scope and number of requests for public records.

Under public records statutes, the public has a right to examine or be provided copies of the public records maintained by the Office of State Examiner. The extensive, global nature of such requests, as experienced by the agency in recent years (nearly 4,000 documents for only <u>one</u> of three major requests) was of such magnitude that it disrupted the normal work flow of the agency and made it difficult to meet certain performance standards or to remain in compliance with our statutory obligations under civil service law.

We are a relatively small agency consisting of seventeen authorized positions and an extremely heavy workload. We have only one copy machine that experiences heavy usage in its normal function of duplicating examinations on a constricted time schedule. We have managed so far to absorb the additional burden that such public records requests have imposed within existing resources. However, if the trend continues, we will have no alternative other than to project additional resources simply for handling such requests.

An additional concern is the confidential nature of tests and the protected information contained within the Office of State Examiner records (such as social security numbers). The agency is currently involved in litigation with an entity seeking to obtain records which the agency feels are confidential. Additional legislation might be necessary to effectively protect information which would compromise the mission of the OSE should it be released subsequent to a public records request.

In recent months, we have been informed that many of the records which the agency has consistently retained over a period of many years are not subject to long-term retention. As a result, the agency is working toward appraising its records and scheduling retention periods for all but permanent records. It is expected that these efforts will effectively diminish the impact of expansive public records requests.

DEVELOPMENT OF GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Having the benefit of experience from the prior strategic planning cycle three years ago, we viewed the development of this strategic plan as an opportunity to evaluate our progress, to assess the needs of our client base, and to focus our efforts and resources. Since the last Strategic Plan was developed, the prior State Examiner retired and Melinda B. Livingston was appointed as the new State Examiner on January 3, 2000, by the State Civil Service Commission following a competitive examination process. Robert S. Lawrence was subsequently appointed by the Commission as Deputy State Examiner. With the change in leadership came a reorganization of agency functions and resource commitments to more effectively accomplish the mission of the agency.

While it is certainly more comforting to look at those things we have done well (and we do feel that there are many aspects of our operation that would fall into that category), we turned a critical eye toward those areas where we needed significant improvement. We closely examined problems which occurred during the last few years vis-a-vis comments from our client base, and discovered that there were also some things that we were really not doing well. There were many valid reasons for the problems, including inexperienced staff and chronic manpower shortage, but the problems became a foundation upon which we could target improvement over the next five years.

The reorganization of agency functions early in 2000 was needed to address an inability to meet some of the performance standards measuring the work of the personnel management and classification functions. When the work of the agency was categorized by the operational plan, it was clear that the Personnel Management and Classification functions represented a large amount of measurable work critical to the mission of the agency as identified by the performance indicators, yet only two personnel were assigned to this combined function. Recognizing the need for additional resources in this area, the new State Examiner separated the functions and doubled the staff assigned by moving employees from the Testing Division.

In examining our new organizational structure in combination with the duties and responsibilities of the State Examiner as identified by the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Law, we developed new goals for this planning period that we believe more closely define the legal mission for the Office of State Examiner. While our prior plan contained performance indicators related to the classification function, it was conspicuously missing at the goal level. The foundation of a class plan is the job analysis, and it is the combination of the two which defines the testing mission. Our first goal, therefore, pertains to the classification function.

<u>GOAL I</u>

I. To develop and maintain validated classification plans in cooperation with the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Board in each jurisdiction which describe the grouping of like positions within the respective fire and police departments into classes which may be treated the same for all personnel purposes, the arrangement of which is designed to show the principal and natural lines of promotion and demotion, and which provide qualification requirements necessary for eligibility for admission to the respective examinations.

The authority for setting this goal is found in Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:2479(G)(1),(2),(5) and 33:2539(1),(2),(5). The Equal Employment Opportunity's *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* was adopted by four Federal agencies in 1978, and is the standard by which the U.S. Justice Department, the EEOC, and the courts would measure our efforts should we be challenged. The *Guidelines* state that any component of the selection process that is used as a part of the selection process should be validated in accordance with the standards.

Objective I.1

We have 915 class descriptions for the jurisdictions within the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service system, but only 87 have been revised following a recent job analysis. There is a group of 372 class descriptions for which a recent job analysis exists, but for which a revision has not been prepared for the consideration of the local civil service board. Finally, there are 456 class descriptions with job analysis supporting documentation that is greater than five years old.

A second problem with the class descriptions is that we do not currently have validity documentation to support the qualification requirements included in our class plan recommendations to the civil service boards. This is a legal exposure for us in that the qualification requirements are absolutely used as part of the selection process, and therefore must be validated according to the *Guidelines*.

Objective I.1 targets having all 915 class descriptions supported by a job analysis less than five years old by June 30, 2006. To insure the validity of the information, the job analysis questionnaires should also be revised and updated so that work procedures are current and qualification validation documentation is gathered.

Objective I.2

The second major issue with the class plans is that we conduct new job analyses in order to prepare the examinations, yet fail to continue the process by using the same information to make updated recommendations on needed class description changes to the civil service boards. We have 372 class descriptions for which we had job analysis information in-house, yet failed to offer an updated class description, as opposed to 87 for which recommendations were made. Once board minutes are received indicating board action in approving class plan recommendations, we need to provide the official copies within a reasonable amount of time. Our current average is 74 days, a number which we feel should be reduced to 14 days. Objective I.2 targets improving our class description recommendations to 90 days and our forwarding of official class plan documents following board action to 14 days following receipt of minutes.

GOAL II

II. To prepare and administer valid tests of fitness, developed according to professionally acceptable standards, for determining eligibility for initial appointment or promotion to classified positions in the respective fire and/or police departments of the municipalities and fire protection districts, score the tests and furnish the results to the local civil service boards for which the tests are given.

Our legal authority for setting this goal may be found in Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:2479(G)(1),(3) and 33:2539(1),(3). The professional standards for this goal are also found in the *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures.*

Objective II.1

This objective targets improving the validity of our examinations, and has three strategies for achieving this objective:

Low fidelity, job simulation testing. Traditional assessment center components are very expensive to both develop and grade, but are able to assess leadership and decision making skills critical to upper level jobs that would ordinarily not be possible with a standard multiple-choice examination. This test format utilizes what appears to be multiple-choice questions, but which are actually situations or problems presented in the question with alternatives for solutions as the answers. The exam material must be developed and validated by panels of subject matter experts who consist of training officials and experienced incumbents in the jobs for which the test material is being developed. Studies have compared this test strategy to assessment center components with a high degree of correlation in the outcome, but for much less expense. We are already doing assessment center testing at the level of Chief, but are targeting low fidelity, job simulation testing for the ranks of Deputy Police Chief, Assistant Police Chief, Police Major, and Police Captain in the police service, and Deputy Fire Chief, Assistant Fire Chief, and District Fire Chief in the fire service.

Documentary support for use of test scores for ranking purposes. Our Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Law only requires support for the tests on a pass/fail basis inasmuch as anyone making a score of 75 or higher is eligible for competitive appointments, and promotional appointments must be offered to the person with a score of 75 or higher with the greatest total departmental seniority. Having said this, however, we are aware that jurisdictions are using the scores for other purposes. One jurisdiction, for example, will not schedule an interview with an individual seeking entrance employment unless he/she scores at least 95 on the test rather than 75. Other jurisdictions utilize scores on examinations in breaking ties in seniority when making promotional appointments. It is therefore incumbent upon our office to develop at least rudimentary support for the scores when used in this manner. Criterion studies are feasible in the entrance classes, although they are very time consuming and expensive to conduct. We are therefore proposing to utilize input from job experts in supporting that the possession of knowledges, skills, and abilities evaluated by our examinations distinguish between levels of performance.

Evaluation of local operating procedures. We have received requests from Chiefs and appointing authorities to include local procedures in our examinations at certain levels. When the Chiefs and appointing authorities assert that such local procedures are critical to the performance of the job in question and are willing to provide updated procedures on an on-going basis, we would be remiss in developing a content valid examination to the exclusion of such a key dimension. One example may be seen in promotional communications classes in departments utilizing a computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system. The procedures followed in accomplishing the work of these classes is entirely dependent upon local procedures and equipment. It is our goal to identify those jurisdictions and classes requiring the development of local material and to respond accordingly.

Objective II.2

We are anticipating a dramatic growth of approximately 50% in the number of jurisdictions served by this office, and must increase both our staff and our efficiency in order to maintain a continuation level of services. Our plans include refining our computer applications, cross training existing staff, and adding two Human Resources Program Consultants by July 1, 2004.

Objective II.3

The Fire Prevention and Fire Investigation classes have been particularly troubling to us from the standpoint of validity. The nature of the work and the knowledge required to function in the respective classes is not as adaptable to common job analysis and exam planning techniques as other classes the fire and police services are. It is very difficult, for example, to determine what knowledge is needed from the first day on the job, versus that for which the incumbent might use a reference source to accomplish his duties. We currently have approximately 12 classes in this series, and would like to develop standardized examinations for use in as many levels statewide as possible. At least four standard examinations would probably be possible, and would alleviate some of the burden on the Testing Division for preparing custom examinations for a single use in these classes.

Objective II.4

The quality of our examinations is dependent upon the quality of test questions (items) available to satisfy the requirements of the examination plans. The Office of State Examiner item bank includes over 11,000 test questions from which tests are developed. There have been critical comments about the practice of the Office of State Examiner in removing problem items during the grading process, and it is our desire to reduce the need for this practice by reviewing and updating all items in our database by June 30,

2006. Outdated test questions should be removed, existing test questions should be sourced to a recent authoritative publication, and new items should be written as needed to supplement needed areas.

GOAL III

III.	**To provide operational guidance in the legal requirements of the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System to the local civil service boards, governing and appointing authorities, department chiefs, employees of the classified fire and police services, and other local officers regarding the duties and obligations imposed upon them by civil service law and relevant State and Federal laws pertaining to the administration and management of personnel within the classified service.**

Objective III.1

We have identified 27 additional jurisdictions as meeting the requirements of our system, and another 42 jurisdictions probably meeting the requirements, but which require further research. It is anticipated that at least half of the latter group will eventually fall within the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System for a dramatic 50% increase in the number of jurisdictions served. The process of identifying and establishing the system at the local level is very labor intensive, yet we have an obligation to do so. Objective III.1 targets providing initial orientation to all 27 identified new jurisdictions to which the system applies by June 30, 2006. It is imperative that we improve our computer database applications to facilitate tracking and documenting this process, as well as adding two additional employees to our table of organization to handle the additional workload.

Objective III.2

Our second objective for Goal III is to improve the technical support we provide to our client base via telephone, correspondence, improved training materials and seminars, and the development of interactive computer applications. We have been frustrated at times when our calls are not returned, so we target returning all calls within 24 hours. We have also set a target of providing written responses to correspondence within 21 days. Other strategies include developing a new training manual specifically designed for appointing authorities, revising our training seminar format, publishing a newsletter at least once each year, and continuing to speak when requested at state conventions of employee and chief groups.

Objective III.3

Objective III.3 takes a different approach to reducing the errors found in personnel actions reported via the Personnel Action Forms (PAFs) through the development of an interactive PAF with help and tutorial functions available through the internet or on disk. It is out desire to reduce the error rate to 4% by June 30, 2006.

Objective III.4

In developing this objective, we explored all aspects of our services that might be made available 24-hours a day via the internet. Most of the strategies are self explanatory, although one which has received a very positive initial reaction is described in Strategy III.4.7. Applicants for Firefighter and Police Officer positions may currently take the test in any location where it is being offered through application to that civil service board. Following receipt of a passing score, the applicant choosing to work elsewhere may make application to the civil service board in the desired employment location by attaching documentation of his/her passing score to the application for the new location. As a means of recruiting, appointing authorities have expressed interest obtaining access to interested, qualified applicants. It is our intention to facilitate the connection between potential employers and employees through a voluntary registry of persons passing the entrance examinations who are interested in employment opportunities other than where they took their examinations.

APPENDIX B

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

STRATEGIC PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2005-06

OFFICE OF STATE EXAMINER
MUNICIPAL FIRE AND POLICE CIVIL SERVICE

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.1

OBJECTIVE I.1: To improve the content validity of classification plans for each jurisdiction by ensuring that each class description is supported by a recent job analysis (less than five years old) by June 30, 2006.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. I.1.a	Total number of class descriptions.
Input Indicator No. I.1.b	Number of class descriptions not supported by job analysis data less than five (5) years old.
Input Indicator No. I.1.c	Number of standard job analysis questionnaires (27).
Output Indicator No. I.1.d	Number of new job analyses conducted to provide documentary support of class descriptions.
Outcome Indicator No. I.1.e	Percent of class descriptions meeting the criteria of having job analysis support less than five (5) years old.
Outcome Indicator No. I.1.f	Percent of class descriptions with qualification requirements supported by appropriate validity documentation.
Outcome Indicator No. I.1.g	Percent of standard job analysis questionnaires revised.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.1

INDICATOR NO. I.1.a

1. Indicator name:

Total number of class descriptions.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   Our objective is to improve the content validity of class plans by ensuring that each class description is supported by a recent job analysis. All class descriptions should reflect current duties and responsibilities, but many do not. The total number of class descriptions serves as the baseline from which work will be measured and is a reasonable indicator.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The Office of State Examiner maintains a class description for each class of positions, as well as occupational indices containing a list of all classifications for each jurisdiction in the classified service. The total number of classifications will be maintained in a database tracking system as classes are adopted or abolished.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Overall tallies are calculated as the database is revised.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The total number of class descriptions will be tallied prior to the reporting period.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   A "class" or "class of positions" means a definitely recognized kind of employment in the classified service, designated to embrace positions that are so nearly alike in the essential character of their duties, responsibilities, and consequent qualification requirements, that they can fairly and equitably be treated alike under like conditions for all personnel purposes. (Louisiana R.S. 33:2473 5 and 33:2533 5.) A class description provides the representative duties of a class, including distinguishing features and qualification requirements, which is adopted and maintained as a rule of the local civil service board in each jurisdiction. A class plan contains the combined class descriptions for all of the classes for a single jurisdiction.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The number of class descriptions is a global indicator of the magnitude and scope the Office of State Examiner's responsibility to assist local civil service board's in their statutory obligation to maintain current classification plans. The number of class descriptions in light of possible revisions following job analyses is a useful tool for planning and forecasting purposes.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.1

INDICATOR NO. I.1.b

1. Indicator name:

Number of class descriptions not supported by job analysis data less than five (5) years old.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   Class descriptions should be kept current and should reflect jobs as they actually exist. As soon as possible following any changes in the duties and responsibilities of a class of positions by the appointing authority, the changes should be reflected in the class plan. It is necessary to have knowledge of the depth of class descriptions which have not been updated following recent job analyses.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   A database will be maintained for each classification, in jurisdiction order, in which the date of completion of each job analysis will be entered.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be entered following the completion of each job analysis project.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The total number of class descriptions supported by job analysis data over five (5) years old will be tabulated prior to the reporting period.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   The job analysis is the systematic examination of the functions of each position as it relates to the knowledge, skills and abilities required to perform the duties assigned to a position. Classification plan means all the classes of positions established for the classified service. Class or class of positions means a definitely recognized kind of employment in the classified service, designated to embrace positions that are so nearly alike in the essential character of their duties, responsibilities, and consequent qualification requirements, that they can fairly and equitably be treated alike under like conditions for all personnel purposes.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The number of class descriptions not supported by job analysis data less than five (5) years old indicates the extent of the challenge to the agency in providing civil service boards with current and validated class descriptions. Where numerous outdated class descriptions may be discovered and targeted for revision, the agency may find it necessary to allocate additional resources.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.1

INDICATOR NO. I.1.c

1. Indicator name:

Number of standard job analysis questionnaires (27).

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   Information about the essential duties and responsibilities assigned to classes of positions is gathered job analysis questionnaires from which class descriptions are validated.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The agency maintains a master file of standard job analysis questionnaires.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   The total number of job analysis questionnaires will be adjusted as new questionnaires are developed or old ones are determined to be obsolete.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The number of standard job analysis questionnaires is counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The agency maintains job analysis questionnaires for the purpose of evaluating positions of the classified service. It is often necessary to revise questionnaires to include new task statements or to provide supplementary information about positions, develop new questionnaires for unique classes of positions, or delete questionnaires which are determined to be obsolete. Proper planning is required to minimize the additional impact upon the work product and efficiency of personnel as a result of keeping questionnaires current.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.1

INDICATOR NO. I.1.d

1. Indicator name:

Number of new job analyses conducted to provide documentary support of class descriptions.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   Our objective is to improve the validity of classification plans for each jurisdiction by ensuring that each class description reflects current duties and responsibilities, and is supported by a recent job analysis. Therefore the actual number of new job analyses conducted to provide validity documentation is a reasonable indicator.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The number of new job analyses conducted will be updated as each job analysis project is completed.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Collection of the data will occur at the completion of each job analysis project.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

Each job analysis performed will be counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The agency has a responsibility to assure that local civil service boards maintain classification plans that accurately reflect duties and responsibilities of positions in the classified service. If this output indicator demonstrates low performance, we are not effectively managing this function and will need to evaluate our work methods toward improvement.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.1

INDICATOR NO. I.1.e

1. Indicator name:

Percent of class descriptions meeting the criteria of having job analysis support less than five (5) years old.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome:

3. Rationale:

   This performance indicator serves as a benchmark for improvement.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be gathered from the job analysis database.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Collection of the data will occur as each job analysis is completed.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Number of class descriptions meeting the criteria of having job analysis support less than five (5) years old divided by total number of class descriptions.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    Low performance in this outcome indicator will indicate that we are not meeting our obligations to assure that civil service boards are maintaining current class descriptions and appropriate action toward improvement will be necessary.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.1

INDICATOR NO. I.1.f

1. Indicator name:

Percent of class descriptions with qualification requirements supported by appropriate validity documentation.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome

3. Rationale:

   Our objective is to improve the validity of classification plans for each jurisdiction by ensuring that each class description is supported by a recent job analysis. Qualification requirements are a part of the class description, and are used in employee selection. Determining the percentage of class descriptions with validated qualification requirements is an indicator of progress toward this objective.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected upon the completion of new class descriptions containing qualification requirements supported by validity documentation.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Collection of the data will occur as each class description is revised.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Number of class descriptions with validated qualification requirements divided by the total number of class descriptions.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    There are currently 915 individual classes of positions in the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System, each having qualification requirements unique to that class. Since qualification requirements are used in the employee selection process it would be prudent to allocate appropriate resources to careful validation methodology and documentation.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.1

INDICATOR NO. I.1.g

1. Indicator name:

Percent of standard job analysis questionnaires revised.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome

3. Rationale:

   Percent of standard job analysis questionnaires revised is an indicator of work product.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Numbers used for calculating this percentage will be gathered from the job analysis database.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will updated as questionnaires are revised.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Number of standard job analysis questionnaires revised divided by total number of questionnaires.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The agency must determine how the workload might be affected by decisions to update existing questionnaires, or the impact that the development of a new questionnaire may have upon the turnaround between initiating the job analysis study and submitting the class plan description.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.2

OBJECTIVE I.2:	By June 30, 2006, improve efficiency of service to local civil service boards by providing timely recommendations to civil service boards on needed class plan changes following all job analyses within 90 days of receipt of job analysis information, and by providing updated class descriptions on changes adopted by boards within fourteen days of receiving minutes of meeting.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. I.2.a	Number of class descriptions identified requiring revision following receipt of recent job analysis information.
Output Indicator No. I.2.b	Number of class description recommendations made to local civil service boards.
Outcome and Efficiency Indicator No. I.2.c	Average number of days between date of receipt of job analysis data and date of recommendation on class plan change to civil service board.
Outcome and Efficiency Indicator No. I.2.d	Average number of days between receipt of minutes of board meeting identifying changes adopted to class plan and date on which completed revisions are forwarded to civil service board.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.2

INDICATOR NO. I.2.a

1. Indicator name:

Number of class descriptions identified requiring revision following receipt of recent job analysis information.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   The number of class descriptions requiring revisions following receipt of recent job analysis information is a measure of work which needs to be done.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be maintained in an integrated database which will provide targets for completion of needed class plan revisions..

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be gathered following job analysis.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

Totals will be updated as job analyses are completed.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    Identifying this number will help the agency determine how best to allocate resources to the function of developing revised class descriptions.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.2

INDICATOR NO. I.2.b

1. Indicator name:

Number of class description recommendations made to local civil service boards.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   This is an obvious indicator of work product.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   A count of class descriptions recommended to local boards will be collected from the job analysis database.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   The count of class descriptions recommended to local boards will be updated as recommendations are forwarded.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Totals will be calculated on an on-going basis.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The agency must provide recommendations for updated class descriptions to local civil service boards upon determining changes in assignments of duties and responsibilities. A low performance in this indicator will demonstrate that we are not being responsive, which may require adjustments in work assignments and/or cross training of other personnel in updating class descriptions.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.2

INDICATOR NO. I.2.c

1. Indicator name:

Average number of days between date of receipt of job analysis data and date of recommendation on class plan change to civil service board.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome and Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   This indicator will demonstrate an improvement or reduction in our responsiveness to local jurisdictions in assisting them in maintaining current class plans.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   As soon as job analysis data is received by the office, the date will be recorded in the database tracking system. The date on which the proposed class plan change will also be recorded.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Collection of this information will be on-going.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

For each job analysis, the number of days from receipt of the job analysis information (completed questionnaires) to the date the recommended class description is forward to the local civil service board will be calculated.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    If there is a lengthy period of time between receipt of job analysis data and the date the class description is proposed, a reevaluation of the processes in this area of operations will be necessary in order to improve efficiency.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL I
OBJECTIVE I.2

INDICATOR NO. I.2.d

1. Indicator name:

Average number of days between receipt of minutes of board meeting identifying changes adopted to class plan and date on which completed revisions are forwarded to civil service board.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome and Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   Various entities maintain a record of their local civil service board's classification plan. In order to preserve the continuity of these records, the Office of State Examiner maintains the official copy of each class description and forwards a copy to each entity following the board's notification of the changes in the class description. The amount of time between the receipt of the board's notification in its minutes and the day completed revisions are returned to the board is an indicator of outcome and efficiency.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The date on which the minutes of board meeting are received which indicate changes adopted by the board and the date the completed revisions are forwarded to the board will be entered in the database tracking system.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Collection of the data will be on-going.

   (b) reporting:

Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

The number of days between receipt of board minutes and the date the completed class description is forwarded to the board will be calculated.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

If the time between receipt of board minutes and the date the completed class description is forwarded is unusually long, a reevaluation of the processes in this area of operations will be necessary in order to improve efficiency.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.1

OBJECTIVE II.1: By June 30, 2006, improve the validity of examinations developed by the Office of State Examiner so that candidates identified as eligible will have the knowledge and skills necessary to be placed in working test period, and so that examinations administered will be legally defensible.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. II.1.a	Number of multi-jurisdictional promotional examinations.
Outcome Indicator No. II.1.b	Percent of standard promotional examinations for which documentary support for score ranking has been established.
Input Indicator No. II.1.c	Number of classes targeted for low fidelity, job simulation testing.
Outcome Indicator No. II.1.d	Number of examination levels for which low fidelity job simulation testing has been developed.
Input Indicator No. II.1.e	Number of requests for development of local test material.
Output Indicator No. II.1.f	Number of tests utilizing the development of local test material.
Outcome and Efficiency Indicator No. II.1.g	Number of challenges to where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity such as the Department of Justice or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has found that an examination, developed and administered by the OSE was not appropriate. (The standard to which we aspire is to have 0 decisions finding fault with our examinations.)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.1

INDICATOR NO. II.1.a

1. Indicator name:

Number of multi-jurisdictional promotional examinations.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   If our objective is to develop documentation to support the use of test scores on standard promotional examinations for ranking purposes, it is necessary to know that there are currently six such examinations in use by the Office of State Examiner.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The number of multi-jurisdictional promotional examinations are counted.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Static, or as changed.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   We counted the number of multi-jurisdictional promotional examinations.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    Some jurisdictions utilize scores on examinations as a means of establishing the order of promotion where candidates share identical seniority. It is incumbent upon our office to develop at least rudimentary support for the scores when used in this manner.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.1

INDICATOR NO. II.1.b

1. Indicator name:

Percent of standard promotional examinations for which documentary support for score ranking has been established.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome

3. Rationale:

   This is an obvious indicator of accomplishment.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   This indicator will be revised as documentary support for score ranking is developed for standard promotional examinations.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   As documentary support is developed.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The number of standard promotional examinations for which documentary support is developed divided by the total number of standard promotional examinations.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    Progress toward accomplishing this task will be monitored and adjustments in work assignments may be necessary in light of other projects. The management team may also study the feasibility of this process for additional standard examinations which may be developed.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.1

INDICATOR NO. II.1.c

1. Indicator name:

Number of classes targeted for low fidelity, job simulation testing.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   The low fidelity, job simulation testing method is desirable in terms of development, administration and scoring for higher level promotional examinations. There are currently seven promotional classes which may be considered for this form of selection procedure.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The number of classes targeted for low fidelity, job simulation testing is counted.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Static, or as changed.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The classes selected for low fidelity, job simulation testing are counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Low fidelity, job simulation tests utilize what appear to be multiple-choice questions, but which are actually situations or problems presented in the question with alternatives for solutions as the answers. Studies have compared this test strategy to assessment center components with a high degree of correlation in the outcome, but for much less expense.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

We must evaluate feasibility and cost effectiveness of developing, administering and scoring low fidelity, job simulation testing as an alternative to other cost prohibitive selection procedures.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.1

INDICATOR NO. II.1.d

1. Indicator name:

Number of examination levels for which low fidelity job simulation testing has been developed.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome

3. Rationale:

   This indicator represents the result of work on developing low fidelity job simulation tests

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected as examinations are developed.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   At the time examinations are developed.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The number of tests developed will be counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

Progress toward accomplishing this task will be monitored and adjustments in work assignments may be necessary in light of other projects.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.1

INDICATOR NO. II.1.e

1. Indicator name:

Number of requests for development of local test material.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   This is an indicator of demand for which work will be done.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected and tallied as requests are made.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   See above.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Requests for development of local test materials will be counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Local test material is defined as any test item developed from the operating procedures provided by the local jurisdictions, such as policies, rules and regulations, and dispatching procedures.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

Developing new items for testing purposes is labor intensive and requires substantial allocation of resources. As these requests increase, we will have to evaluate their impact upon operations in light of other projects and make adjustments accordingly.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.1

INDICATOR NO. II.1.f

1. Indicator name:

Number of tests utilizing the development of local test material.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   This indicator represents work product resulting from requests for the use of local test material.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The total number will be calculated as tests are developed.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   See above.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Tests developed utilizing local test material will be counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    Progress toward accomplishing this task will be monitored and adjustments in work assignments may be necessary in light of other projects.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.1

INDICATOR NO. II.1.g

1. Indicator name:

Number of challenges to where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity such as the Department of Justice or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has found that an examination, developed and administered by the OSE was not appropriate. (The standard to which we aspire is to have 0 decisions finding fault with our examinations.)

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome and Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   If examinations are valid and are developed according to applicable professional standards, we should have no decisions finding fault with our examinations. Efficiency, therefore, is measured by the absence of such decisions, and our goal is to have no adverse decisions.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   At any time a challenge is made to an examination, a file is initiated in our office. A database will be established to monitor any examinations being challenged and the outcome.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be entered into the database as examinations are challenged. As the issue is resolved, any adverse decisions by the challenging body will be entered.

   (b) reporting:

Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

Any adverse decisions concerning the validity or appropriateness of these examinations shall be reported.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

When there is a prevailing legal climate that expands the normal amount of challenges to examinations, or when some part of our validation and examination development process comes under close scrutiny by one of the regulatory bodies, it might be prudent to allocate additional resources to the careful methodology utilized in the examination development process.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.2

OBJECTIVE II.2: To continue providing examination scores to local civil service boards within 120 days from receipt of exam request despite an anticipated 50% increase in number of jurisdictions to which the system will apply by June 30,2006.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. II.2.a	Number of examination requests.
Outcome and Efficiency: Indicator No. II.2.b	Number of days from date of examination request to date scores are mailed.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.2

INDICATOR NO. II.2.a

1. Indicator name:

Number of examination requests.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   If our objective is to maintain our current turnaround despite a significant increase in our customer base, our ability to respond to this challenge is directly influenced by the number of exam requests which are received in this office. The receipt of the exam request is what initiates the flow of work related to examinations through the office.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Exam requests are received from the local civil service boards either by telephone, by letter, or as indicated in the minutes of the board. As soon as the request is received in this office, a workload tracking record is initiated. Each test requested for each jurisdiction is counted as a separate exam request.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data is entered daily into the workload tracking system as the examination requests are received from the local civil service boards. Overall tallies are computed prior to reporting periods.

   (b) reporting:

Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

Each test requested for each jurisdiction is counted as a separate exam request. Our workload tracking database for exam requests is organized by jurisdiction and date. A separate field indicates the number of exam requests for that date, so that the total may be computed from the index page.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

Management carefully evaluates the volume of examination requests being received at any given time in order to assure that agency remains responsive to the needs of the local jurisdictions. A high demand for examinations has a direct impact upon the exam development process requiring the allocation of additional resources.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.2

INDICATOR NO. II.2.b

1. Indicator name:

Number of days from date of examination request to date scores are mailed.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome and Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   Our objective is to continue providing examination scores to local civil service boards within an established time frame despite a significant increase in the number of jurisdictions, so this is an obvious indicator of both outcome and efficiency.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Exam requests are received from the local civil service boards either by telephone, by letter, or as indicated in the minutes of the board. As soon as the request is received in this office, a workload tracking record is initiated. An entry is also made to indicate the date on which the grades were mailed.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be entered at the time the grades are mailed. Overall computations will be made at the time the data is reported.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   For each test, the number of days from receipt of examination request to mailing of grades to local civil service boards will be calculated.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    If we fail to maintain the time required for this process, the management team needs to reevaluate each step in the process, and determine how we might improve our efficiency.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.3

OBJECTIVE II.3: By June 30, 2006, to complete a major analysis of all Fire Prevention and Fire Investigation classes statewide (approximately 12 class titles) and develop standard, multi-jurisdictional examinations for use in as many levels statewide as possible.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. II.3.a	Number of Fire Prevention classes targeted for multi-jurisdictional test development.
Output Indicator No. II.3.b	Number of Fire Prevention validation projects completed.
Outcome & Efficiency Indicator No. II.3.c	Number of challenges where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity such as the Department of Justice or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has found that an examination in the Fire Prevention series was not appropriate. (The standard to which we aspire is to have 0 decisions finding fault with our examinations.)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.3

INDICATOR NO. II.3.a

1. Indicator name:

Number of Fire Prevention classes targeted for multi-jurisdictional test development.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   Experience indicates that there are many similarities in the duties and responsibilities assigned to the various positions of Fire Prevention classes across jurisdictions. Some may be so similar that they may be grouped together for testing purposes, allowing one examination to be developed for use in multiple jurisdictions. In order to determine which classes might be grouped in such a manner, we must first identify all Fire Prevention classes.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The number of Fire Prevention classes targeted for multi-jurisdictional test development will be gathered from the indices of class titles.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Fire Prevention classes will be counted and recorded prior to beginning the job analysis project of all Fire Prevention classes.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The number of all Fire Prevention classes will be tallied.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    There is an economy of scale in test environments where the job duties across jurisdictions for the same class title are so similar that the use of the same examination may be desirable. The similarities may be so common as to warrant a study to determine if standardization may be a cost-effective alternative to developing several examinations customized for individual jurisdictions.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.3

INDICATOR NO. II.3.b

1. Indicator name:

Number of Fire Prevention validation projects completed.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   In order to administer standard examinations for use in jurisdictions statewide, it is necessary to develop supporting validation documentation.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Completion of the work will be indicated by agency validation reports and entered into the job analysis tracking system.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Collection of the data will occur as validation projects are completed.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Specific validation projects completed will be counted and named.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

A validation study is the process of insuring that examinations are job related and measure what they purport to measure. Content validity of an examination is demonstrated by the method used to develop the test. It is based on a job analysis that identifies critical tasks performed on the job, then determines what knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) are necessary in order to perform the critical tasks. The test developed under a content validity strategy should be designed around these identified KSAs that are linked to critical tasks performed on the job. To determine the criterion related validity of an examination, on the other hand, one must compare the performance on the examination with some objective measure of success on the job for a control group. The resulting validity coefficient is actually a correlation coefficient of these two variables.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

The number of Fire Prevention validation projects completed will determine the number of standard, multi-jurisdictional examinations which will have to be constructed. This will also drive the development of new items for use in the examinations. The agency will have to evaluate how best to integrate and accomplish this additional work while meeting other workload demands.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.3

INDICATOR NO. II.3.c

1. Indicator name:

Number of challenges where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity such as the Department of Justice or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has found that an examination in the Fire Prevention series was not appropriate. (The standard to which we aspire is to have 0 decisions finding fault with our examinations.)

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome and Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   If examinations are valid and are developed according to applicable professional standards, we should have no decisions finding fault with our examinations. Efficiency, therefore, is measured by the absence of such decisions, and our goal is to have no adverse decisions.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   At any time a challenge is made to an examination, a file is initiated in our office. A database will be established to monitor any examinations being challenged and the outcome.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be entered into the database as examinations are challenged. As the issue is resolved, any adverse decisions by the challenging body will be entered.

   (b) reporting:

Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Any adverse decisions concerning the validity or appropriateness of these examinations shall be reported.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    When there is a prevailing legal climate that expands the normal amount of challenges to examinations, or when some part of our validation and examination development process comes under close scrutiny by one of the regulatory bodies, it might be prudent to allocate additional resources to the careful methodology utilized in the examination development process.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.4

OBJECTIVE II.4: Improve quality of examinations and efficiency of exam preparation by conducting a comprehensive review and update of all 11,000+ test questions in OSE database from which tests are drawn by June 30, 2006.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. II.4.a	Number of test questions in item bank.
Output Indicator No. II.4.b	Number of test items reviewed and removed from item bank.
Output Indicator No. II.4.c	Number of test items updated or revised.
Output Indicator No. II.4.d	Number of test items researched and sourced to new reference edition.
Output Indicator No. II.4.e	Number of new test items written to satisfy requirements of examination plans.
Outcome and Efficiency Indicator No. II.4.f	Number of test questions which must be removed during the grading process due to problems with item construction or source.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.4

INDICATOR NO. II.4.a

1. Indicator name:

Number of test questions in item bank.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   The number of test questions in the item bank represents a measure of the magnitude of the project.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The total number of test questions in the item bank will be compiled.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   A running tally will be maintained of items that are developed or deleted from the item bank.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The total will be calculated for each reporting period following all additions and deletions to the item bank.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The number of test questions in the item bank demonstrates the magnitude of the challenge to maintain viable test materials and the need to assure that test questions comply with technical standards for item construction. Developing examinations from an item bank that includes outdated, unsourced or poorly performing items reduces efficiency in exam development, and affects the quality of the examinations.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.4

INDICATOR NO. II.4.b

1. Indicator name:

Number of test items reviewed and removed from item bank.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   This is an obvious indicator of work product associated with the objective.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected as test questions in the item bank are reviewed and removed.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be updated as often as items are reviewed and removed.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   A running total of deleted items will be maintained.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    A low value for this performance indicator may indicate that staff may be neglecting this function or may need additional training with emphasis on the principles of item writing, or that other projects may be taking precedence. In either case, management must take the necessary steps to assure that this work is accomplished.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.4

INDICATOR NO. II.4.c

1. Indicator name:

Number of test items updated or revised.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   This is an obvious indicator of work product associated with the objective.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected as test questions in the item bank are updated or revised.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be updated as often as items are updated or revised.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   A running total of updated or revised items will be maintained.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    A low value for this performance indicator may indicate that staff may be neglecting this function or may need additional training with emphasis on the principles of item writing, or that other projects may be taking precedence. In either case, management must take the necessary steps to assure that this work is accomplished.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.4

INDICATOR NO. II.4.d

1. Indicator name:

Number of test items researched and sourced to new reference edition.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   Questions developed for use on multiple choice tests are sourced to text which are currently in print and which are generally recognized as authoritative in the subject matter for which the items are intended to measure knowledge, skills or abilities. Those items which cannot be sourced to recognized text are deleted from the item bank.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected as test questions in the item bank are successfully sourced.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be updated as often as items are successfully sourced.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

A running total of successfully sourced items will be maintained.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    A low value for this performance indicator may indicate that staff may be neglecting this function, or that other projects may be taking precedence. In either case, management must take the necessary steps to assure that this work is accomplished.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.4

INDICATOR NO. II.4.e

1. Indicator name:

Number of new test items written to satisfy requirements of examination plans.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   New test questions must be developed in order to maintain a sufficient quantity of different items with which to measure job knowledge. This enables test developers to construct alternate forms and reduces familiarity with test materials which may be obtained from the frequent use of test items.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected as new test questions are added to the item bank.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be updated as often as new items are added to the item bank.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

A running total will be kept of new items added to the item bank.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

The majority of examinations developed by the agency are customized for individual jurisdictions, and frequently necessitate the development of new test items. Research and development of new test items is a time consuming endeavor which requires a significant dedication of personnel resources, including upper management personnel for the review and approval process.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL II
OBJECTIVE II.4

INDICATOR NO. II.4.f

1. Indicator name:

Number of test questions which must be removed during the grading process due to problems with item construction or source.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome and Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   Although every effort is made prior to the administration of an examination to avoid the inclusion of unacceptable test items, some do escape the review and proofing process. Items which have been found to be faulty during the grading process must be immediately revised or removed from the item bank. (Such items are not included in the scoring process.)

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected as the test questions are revised or removed from the item bank.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be updated as often as items are revised or added to the item bank.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

A running total will be kept of items that are revised or removed from the item bank.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    Items which are found to be faulty during the grading process must be immediately revised or removed from the item bank. The management team must be constantly vigilant in evaluating the test development and item development processes and dedicating appropriate additional resources to these processes in order to assure that examinations are of the highest quality.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.1

OBJECTIVE III.1: To provide initial orientation by June 30, 2006, to local governing authorities in 27 new jurisdictions to which the system applies concerning the requirements of Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Law, and assisting such entities in establishing civil service boards.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. III.1.a	Number of potential jurisdictions identified as meeting the criteria for establishing a civil service system.
Output Indicator No. III.1.b	Number of potential jurisdictions with whom initial orientation has been completed.
Outcome Indicator No. III.1.c	Percentage of jurisdictions identified as meeting applicability requirements for inclusion in system for whom initial orientation has been completed.
Outcome and Efficiency Indicator No. III.1.d	Number of new jurisdictions added for whom boards have been sworn in.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.1

INDICATOR NO. III.1.a

1. Indicator name:

Number of potential jurisdictions identified as meeting the criteria for establishing a civil service system.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   The Office of State Examiner is required to assist and cooperate in an advisory capacity the various authorities, departments, officers, and employees of the municipalities, parishes and fire protection districts regarding the duties and obligations imposed upon them by the provisions of civil service law. In order to appropriately fulfill this obligation, we must first identify all jurisdictions which potentially meet the criteria for compliance, perform any necessary research, and establish contact with appropriate authorities, all of which is very labor intensive.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The number of potential jurisdictions obtained from a variety of sources including other state departments or agencies, direct contact from local officials and employees, news articles, and website information will be maintained in a database tracking system.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   A database tracking system will be maintained of all jurisdictions which potentially meet the criteria for establishing a civil service system. As new civil service boards are sworn in, these jurisdictions will be removed from this database.

(b) reporting:

Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

The total of potential jurisdictions will be maintained on an ongoing basis.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

A potential jurisdiction is a municipality, parish or fire protection district which is not currently under the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System, but which meets the population requirements and/or employs full-time paid personnel.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Test Development Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

The number of potential jurisdictions identified as meeting the criteria for establishing a civil service system represents present work as well as the immediate future growth of the classified service. Work involved in researching and identifying potential jurisdictions is labor intensive and requires specific dedication of time and energy of the agency's administration and the resources of the Personnel Management division. As jurisdictions are added, the workload will shift and to the Classification and Test Development divisions. The management team must plan for the unavoidable increase in workload throughout its operations in order to maintain productivity, including the addition of positions to the table of organization.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.1

INDICATOR NO. III.1.b

1. Indicator name:

Number of potential jurisdictions with whom initial orientation has been completed.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   This output indicator is an obvious measure of accomplishment toward satisfying this objective.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   This total will be maintained in a database tracking system for potential jurisdictions and updated as officials are contacted and provided initial orientation.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data for this performance indicator will be updated as initial orientations are provided.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   All initial orientations provided potential jurisdictions will be recorded and counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    Establishing contact with potential jurisdictions and providing initial orientation to local officials requires a significant allocation of time, travel, and personnel resources.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.1

INDICATOR NO. III.1.c

1. Indicator name:

Percentage of jurisdictions identified as meeting applicability requirements for inclusion in system for whom initial orientation has been completed.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome

3. Rationale:

   The percentage of jurisdictions for whom initial orientation has been completed is a measure of work accomplished.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be maintained as orientations are completed and percentages calculated for reporting periods.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be collected as orientations are completed.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

Number of jurisdictions identified as meeting applicability requirements for inclusion in system for whom initial orientation has been completed divided by the total of all such identified jurisdictions.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

This indicator is useful in planning any necessary follow-up support for potential and newly established civil service systems.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.1

INDICATOR NO. III.1.d

1. Indicator name:

Number of new jurisdictions added for whom boards have been sworn in.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome and Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   Making new jurisdictions operational is a direct out-growth of administrative support offered by the Office of State Examiner.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Agency records are updated as new jurisdictions are added.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be collected as the jurisdictions are added to the system.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The number of new jurisdictions will be added.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Jurisdiction refers to the municipality, parish or fire protection district to which the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service system becomes applicable, and who are either in the developmental stage or have civil service boards already sworn in.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

The number of new jurisdictions represents an increase in the size of the system that will have impact on the budgetary and planning processes, i.e., more jurisdictions represents more necessary resources.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.2

OBJECTIVE III.2: To improve service to jurisdictions through timely support to those involved in the operation of the system at the local level through telephone support, correspondence, seminars, individual orientation sessions, and revised training materials with interactive components, by June 30, 2006.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. III.2.a	Number of telephone inquiries received.
Efficiency Indicator No. III.2.b	Percent of telephone inquiries handled within twenty-four hours.
Input Indicator No. III.2.c	Number of written requests for guidance.
Efficiency Indicator No. III.2.d	Percent of written requests for guidance handled within twenty-one days.
Input Indicator No. III.2.e	Number of civil service minutes reviewed.
Output Indicator No. III.2.f	Number of newsletters published per year.
Outcome Indicator No. III.2.g	Number of individuals trained through seminars or individual orientation.
Quality Indicator No. III.2.h	Percentage of seminar attendees rating training as informative and helpful.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.2

INDICATOR NO. III.2.a

1. Indicator name:

Number of telephone inquiries received.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   The Office of State Examiner responds to numerous telephone inquiries from throughout the State on any given workday, and it is through this means that the majority of support is provided to those involved in the operation of the system. The number of telephone inquiries received is a direct measure of work performed.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Personnel who are specifically designated to provide advice and guidance are assigned specially equipped telephone equipment. Data will be collected from a display on each telephone set, and recorded. Totals from each set will be added weekly.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be collected as telephone inquiries are received, and totaled on a daily basis. Agency totals derived from each telephone set will be tabulated weekly.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Telephone inquiries will be added.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of data for this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    It is helpful to know the extent to which we are providing telephone support to jurisdictions, and tracking the number of telephone inquiries is useful for planning purposes. If a certain individual is receiving an inordinate number of calls, this may have an affect upon that person's productivity, and steps may be taken to spread the calls equally among others. Also, a high or low volume of calls recorded for specific times of the year may be useful for project planning.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.2

INDICATOR NO. III.2.b

1. Indicator name:

Percent of telephone inquiries handled within twenty-four hours.

2. Indicator type:

   Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   The percent of telephone inquiries handled within twenty-four hours is a measure of responsiveness and is a reasonable indicator.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The data will be collected from a daily tally of telephone inquiries for which a call-back was made.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   The data will be collected daily.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The number of call-backs within twenty-four hours divided by the total number of inquiries requiring a call-back.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    A high percentage for this indicator represents efficiency and responsiveness, whereas a low percentage indicates an area of our operations which would require corrective action.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.2

INDICATOR NO. III.2.c

1. Indicator name:

Number of written requests for guidance.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   The Office of State Examiner responds to many written requests for guidance during any given workweek. Because such requests usually deal with policy or the application of civil service law, only those in upper management are designated to respond. The number and scope of these requests are such that they frequently require a significant dedication of time and effort.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The data will be collected and recorded in a database tracking system as requests are received by mail or by fax.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be collected as requests are received.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

The number of written requests received in our office will be added.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

   There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

   Agency management responds to written requests only in writing, which often involves complex subject matter. Inasmuch as this indicator is representative of actual work, management must consider the impact that written responses have upon productivity in order to remain responsive through effective planning and prioritization .

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.2

INDICATOR NO. III.2.d

1. Indicator name:

Percent of written requests for guidance handled within twenty-one days.

2. Indicator type:

   Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   The percent of written inquiries handled within twenty-one days is a measure of responsiveness and is a reasonable indicator.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The data will be collected from a database tracking system for written inquiries for which written responses were prepared.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   As responses to written inquiries are prepared and sent.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The number of written responses prepared and sent within twenty-one days divided by the total number of written inquiries.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    Inasmuch as this indicator is representative of actual work, management must consider the impact that written responses have upon productivity in order to remain responsive through effective planning and prioritization .

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.2

INDICATOR NO. III.2.e

1. Indicator name:

Number of civil service minutes reviewed.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   A primary means of assisting local civil service boards and appointing authorities in the operation of the civil service system at the local level is though a diligent review of the minutes of the civil service board meetings from each jurisdiction. When problems are noted, contact is made with appropriate local personnel via telephone or letter so that corrective action might be taken.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Each set of minutes received by the Office of State Examiner is logged into a computer database as soon as it is received in the office, along with the date of receipt. Review of the minutes is generally accomplished within a week of receipt so that we might offer timely advice as necessary. The total of minutes received will be tallied at the conclusion of the reporting period.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be gathered daily as the minutes of the meetings are processed. The overall total will be compiled at the time of reporting.

   (b) reporting:

Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   See above.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    We carefully track the minutes received from each jurisdiction and follow up with local officials when none have been received over an extended period of time. Reviewing the minutes of the local civil service boards is an extremely cost effective tool in monitoring and providing needed guidance on the operation of the system at the local level. The aggregate of all board minutes received and reviewed is indicative, on an indirect level, of the amount of administrative support necessary in the local areas. If we become unable to keep up with this task in a timely manner, it will be necessary to reevaluate our priorities and allocation of resources accordingly.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.2

INDICATOR NO. III.2.f

1. Indicator name:

Number of newsletters published per year.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   The agency newsletter is a means by which information about the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service is disseminated and helps to maintain and improve administrative support to the local jurisdictions.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   A tally of all newsletters published will be maintained on an annual basis and maintained in a database tracking system.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   See above.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

The count of all newsletters published per year will be maintained.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The newsletter is published and distributed to civil service board members and board secretaries, department chiefs, and various local authorities. Its purpose is to provide information about legal changes impacting the system, advise of new developments in the Office of State Examiner, and to offer answers to frequently asked questions. If we are unable to produce the newsletter, this information will not be as effectively disseminated, and will require the agency to provide this information by other means.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.2

INDICATOR NO. III.2.g

1. Indicator name:

Number of individuals trained through seminars or individual orientation.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome

3. Rationale:

   Training seminars provide direct hands-on training for local officials charged with administering the system at the local level, and is a direct measure of administrative support offered by the Office of State Examiner.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected as the seminars and individual orientation are conducted and will be maintained in an attendance log.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   See above.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

The total number of individuals attending seminars and individual orientation during the reporting period will be counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The number of individuals attending seminars and individual orientation will be useful in planning future training ventures.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.2

INDICATOR NO. III.2.h

1. Indicator name:

Percentage of seminar attendees rating training as informative and helpful.

2. Indicator type:

   Quality

3. Rationale:

   It is valuable for planning future training programs to obtain an idea of the strengths and weaknesses of those programs.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Attendees will be asked to complete brief evaluation questionnaires, from which this data will be collected.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Upon completion of each seminar.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Totals will be calculated for various levels of satisfaction from which percentages will be derived.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The Office of State Examiner will use the information from these surveys to improve and plan future seminars.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.3

OBJECTIVE III.3: To reduce the percentage of Personnel Action Forms (PAFs) which must be returned to local jurisdictions to 4.00% by June 30, 2006, through training of local personnel and interactive computer based tutorial to facilitate correct personnel actions.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. III.3.a	Number of personnel action forms received.
Output Indicator No. III.3.b	Number of personnel action forms reviewed for compliance with civil service law.
Outcome Indicator No. III.3.c	Number of personnel action forms returned to jurisdictions for correction.
Efficiency Indicator No. III.3.d	Total number of PAFs returned divided by total received.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.3

INDICATOR NO. III.3.a

1. Indicator name:

Number of personnel action forms received.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   The Office of State Examiner reviews personnel actions reported on these forms for compliance with provisions of civil service law, and, when necessary, provide advisory feedback to the civil service boards and appointing authorities so that appropriate corrective action may be taken.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   A log is kept of personnel action forms as they are received in this office.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   The personnel action forms are logged in as they are received.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The total of personnel action forms received for a given period of time will be tabulated prior to the reporting period.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   The personnel action form is a vehicle created by the Office of State Examiner by which the appointing authorities may report personnel actions in a standard format to local civil service boards. The local civil service boards, in turn, report the personnel actions to this office. Personnel actions reported on these forms include, but are not limited to appointment, promotion, demotion, suspension, termination, and leaves of absence

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The number of personnel action forms received by this office continues to increase. We must continue to look at the allocation of personnel to the function of reviewing and processing the personnel action forms, or explore other alternatives such as automation through scanning capabilities.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.3

INDICATOR NO. III.3.b

1. Indicator name:

Number of personnel action forms reviewed for compliance with civil service law.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   Once the personnel actions are reported via the personnel action form, personnel within the Office of State Examiner review the actions taken vis-a-vis civil service law.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   When personnel action forms are reviewed, the information is entered into a database.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data is entered into the database at the time of review.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The number of personnel action forms reviewed will be an aggregate of those found to be in compliance with civil service law and those which found to be not in compliance and which must be returned to the local civil service board for corrective action.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    As we are a very small office, only one person is generally responsible for this critical function. However, it is sometimes necessary to divert personnel assigned to the function to other projects, which causes a backlog in unprocessed forms. When the number forms processed fails to keep pace with the number received, we must be prepared to realign duties and cross-train other personnel as necessary so that this critical function is not delayed past the point when timely advice will be valuable to those at the local level.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.3

INDICATOR NO. III.3.c

1. Indicator name:

Number of personnel action forms returned to jurisdictions for correction.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome

3. Rationale:

   The reason for reviewing the personnel action forms is to provide a check that the personnel actions made at the local level are done in compliance with civil service law. The personnel actions returned indicate that the system is not operating at the local level as it should.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   A log is kept of personnel action forms returned to the jurisdictions.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   A log is kept of personnel action forms returned to local civil service boards for corrective action at the time the from is returned.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

The number of personnel action forms returned by jurisdiction is tallied for an overall total.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    We are attempting to improve the error rate through education and training of personnel at the local level. The number of forms returned, and the reasons therefor, should guide our future education efforts.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.3

INDICATOR NO. III.3.d

1. Indicator name:

Total number of PAFs returned divided by total received.

2. Indicator type:

   Efficiency

3. Rationale:

   Our objective is to educate those responsible for operating the system at the local level so that a smaller percentage of personnel action forms must be returned for corrective action. It is therefore appropriate to examine the percentage of forms returned as an indicator of efficiency.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Explained in prior indicator.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data for this indicator will be computed at the time of reporting.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Self explanatory.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Personnel Management Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

Our efficiency in training the personnel at the local level is measured by this indicator. If we are not improving the manner in which personnel actions are made and reported in accordance with civil service law, we need to reexamine our training efforts and make changes as needed.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MATRIX

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.4

OBJECTIVE III.4: To increase service to jurisdictions and to applicants for employment in the system through the e-government concept by adding online, interactive services in ten (10) areas by June 30, 2006.

Kind of Indicator	Performance Indicator
Input Indicator No. III.4.a	Number of informational categories on agency website.
Output Indicator No. III.4.b	Number of new informational categories added to website.
Output Indicator No. III.4.c	Number of visitors (hits) to website.
Outcome Indicator No. III.4.d	Percent increase in informational categories on website.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.4

INDICATOR NO. III.4.a

1. Indicator name:

Number of informational categories on agency website.

2. Indicator type:

   Input

3. Rationale:

   Offering information on the agency website is a method of utilizing e-government technology to expand services and support to local jurisdictions.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The agency web support specialist will maintain an up-to-date list of the available informational categories.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be collected as often as the website is updated.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The total number of informational categories will be counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    Informational categories posted to the agency's website provides a cost-effective service to persons seeking specific information. This promotes productivity of personnel who may otherwise be required to respond to routine telephone calls or letters of inquiry, and frees time for other necessary tasks.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.4

INDICATOR NO. III.4.b

1. Indicator name:

Number of new informational categories added to website.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   New informational categories added to the website improves the administrative support to local jurisdictions.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   See previous indicator.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   This data will be added as new categories are added to the website.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The total number of categories added to the website will be counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

   Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    See previous performance indicator.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.4

INDICATOR NO. III.4.c

1. Indicator name:

Number of visitors (hits) to website.

2. Indicator type:

   Output

3. Rationale:

   This indicator is a measure of the usefulness of the website and its value as a source of information.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   Data will be collected from a counter imbedded in the website.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be collected and counted each time the website is accessed.

   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   The total number of visitors (hits) will be counted.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    This indicator will be helpful in planning future website categories.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

GOAL III
OBJECTIVE III.4

INDICATOR NO. III.4.d

1. Indicator name:

Percent increase in informational categories on website.

2. Indicator type:

   Outcome

3. Rationale:

   This indicator is a measure of improvement in providing on-line administrative support.

4. Data collection procedure/source:

   The agency web support specialist will maintain an up-to-date count of the available informational categories, and determine the percentage increase.

5. Frequency and timing of

   (a) collection:

   Data will be updated as informational categories are added.
   (b) reporting:

   Data will be reported quarterly, or as required by OPB.

6. Calculation methodology:

   Percentage increases will be calculated for the reporting periods.

7. Definitions of any unclear terms:

Not applicable.

8. What aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed:

   No aggregations or disaggregation of the indicator are needed.

9. Who is responsible for data collection and quality:

   Gathering of this performance indicator will be the responsibility of the Classification Manager.

10. Limitations of the indicator:

    There do not appear to be significant limitations for this indicator.

11. How is this performance indicator used in management decision making and other agency processes?

    The percent increase in the number of informational categories on the agency's website is an indication of the continued efforts to improve administrative support through e-government technology. If no change or a decrease in this indicator occurs, other opportunities for improving on-line assistance should be explored.

APPENDIX C

LOUISIANA VISION 2020 COMPONENTS

APPENDIX C

LOUISIANA: VISION 2020 COMPONENTS

OBJECTIVES **STRATEGIC PLAN** **2001-02 through 2005-06**	**OBJECTIVES** ***LOUISIANA: VISION 2020***
OBJECTIVE I.1: To improve the content validity of classification plans for each jurisdiction by ensuring that each class description is supported by a recent job analysis (less than five years old) by June 30, 2006.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** The maintenance of a structured classification plan supported by recent job analysis information will allow civil service boards and fire and police departments to achieve more efficient administration and more equitable treatment of personnel.
OBJECTIVE I.2: By June 30, 2006, improve efficiency of service to local civil service boards by providing timely recommendations to civil service boards on needed class plan changes following all job analyses within 90 days of receipt of job analysis information, and by providing updated class descriptions on changes adopted by boards within fourteen days of receiving minutes of meeting.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** Improving the turnaround from completion of a job analysis to the final submission of an official class description contributes to more efficient administration of classified personnel.
OBJECTIVE II.1: By June 30, 2006, improve the validity of examinations developed by the Office of State Examiner so that candidates identified as eligible will have the knowledge and skills necessary to be placed in working test period, and so that examinations administered will be legally defensible.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** **OBJECTIVE 3.3 - To have safe homes, schools, and streets throughout the State.** By improving the validity of examinations administered by this office, local jurisdictions are provided a better pool of applicants from which to select for positions in law enforcement and fire protection. Valid tests which are predictive of success contribute to public safety and efficiency of service to our citizens.

OBJECTIVES **STRATEGIC PLAN** **2001-02 through 2005-06**	**OBJECTIVES** ***LOUISIANA: VISION 2020***
OBJECTIVE II.2: To continue providing examination scores to local civil service boards within 120 days from receipt of exam request despite an anticipated 50% increase in number of jurisdictions to which the system will apply by June 30, 2006.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** **OBJECTIVE 3.3 - To have safe homes, schools, and streets throughout the State.** By providing examination scores to local boards in a timely manner, our office becomes more responsive to the needs of local governments which must assure adequate staffing levels and deployment of public safety personnel.
OBJECTIVE II.3: By June 30, 2006, to complete a major analysis of all Fire Prevention and Fire Investigation classes statewide (approximately 12 class titles) and develop standard, multi-jurisdictional examinations for use in as many levels statewide as possible.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** **OBJECTIVE 3.3 - To have safe homes, schools, and streets throughout the State.** There is an economy of scale in test environments where the job duties across jurisdictions for the same class title are so similar as to warrant the use of the same examination.
OBJECTIVE II.4: Improve quality of examinations and efficiency of exam preparation by conducting a comprehensive review and update of all 11,000+ test questions in database from which tests are drawn by June 30, 2006.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** **OBJECTIVE 3.3 - To have safe homes, schools, and streets throughout the State.** Improving and maintaining a database of quality test items contributes to more efficient test administration procedures, and results in examinations for public safety positions which are more predictive of success.
OBJECTIVE III.1: To provide initial orientation by June 30, 2006, to local authorities in 27 new jurisdictions to which the system applies concerning the requirements of Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Law, and assisting such entities in establishing civil service boards.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** Providing training and orientation to local authorities regarding compliance with the provisions of civil service law reduces errors in personnel administration and encourages adherence to the principles of merit, efficiency, and fitness.

OBJECTIVES STRATEGIC PLAN 2001-02 through 2005-06	OBJECTIVES *LOUISIANA: VISION 2020*
OBJECTIVE III.2: To improve service to jurisdictions through timely support to those involved in the operation of the system at the local level through telephone support, correspondence, seminars, individual orientation sessions, and revised training materials with interactive components by June 30, 2006.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** Providing administrative support through various means of contact reduces errors in personnel administration and encourages adherence to the principles of merit, efficiency, and fitness.
OBJECTIVE III.3: To reduce the percentage of Personnel Action Forms (PAFs) which must be returned to local jurisdictions to 4.00% by June 30, 2006, through training of local personnel and interactive computer based tutorial to facilitate correct personnel actions.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** The Office of State Examiner is charged by Civil Service Law to provide advice and assistance to local jurisdictions in matters of personnel administration of fire and police personnel. Our ability to provide these services contributes to the improvement of the efficiency and accountability of governmental entities such as civil service boards, and appointing and governing authorities, including city councils, boards of aldermen, and fire boards of commissioners, which ultimately influences the quality of service in areas of public safety.
OBJECTIVE III.4: To increase service to jurisdictions and to applicants for employment in the system through the e-government concept by adding online, interactive services in ten (10) areas by June 30, 2006.	**OBJECTIVE 1.8 - To improve the efficiency and accountability of governmental agencies.** The development and use of e-government technology will improve the agency's ability to disseminate information efficiently and effectively in terms of both cost and productivity, and will also facilitate the application and employment opportunities to persons who wish to seek employment with departments under the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF JURISDICTIONS/EMPLOYEES UNDER THE MUNICIPAL FIRE AND POLICE CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

STRATEGIC PLAN
FISCAL YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2005-06

OFFICE OF STATE EXAMINER
MUNICIPAL FIRE AND POLICE CIVIL SERVICE
JURISDICTIONS UNDER MUNICIPAL FIRE & POLICE CIVIL SERVICE
AS OF JUNE 30, 2001

JURISDICTION	PARISH	POPULATION BASED ON 2000 CENSUS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES	
			FIRE	POLICE
Abbeville	Vermillion	11,887	33	41
Alexandria	Rapides	46,342	117	180
Ascension FPD (Gonzales)	Ascension	8,156	--	--
Baker	East Baton Rouge	13,793	21	30
Bastrop	Morehouse	12,988	48	56
Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	227,818	513	748
Benton FPD #4	Bossier		3	--
Bogalusa	Washington	13,365	37	50
Bossier City	Bossier	56,461	171	170
Bossier East Central F.P.D. #1 * (Haughton)	Bossier	2,792	--	--
Caddo Parish FPD #1 (Blanchard)	Caddo	2,050	12	--
Caddo Parish FPD #3 (Greenwood)	Caddo	2,458	13	--
Caddo Parish FPD #4 (Keithville)	Caddo		9	--
Caddo Parish FPD #5 (Shreveport)	Caddo		3	--
Caddo Parish FPD #6 (Keithville)	Caddo		6	--
Caddo Parish FPD #7 * (Oil City)	Caddo	1,219	--	--
Caddo Parish FPD #8 * (Vivian)	Caddo	4,031	--	--
Calcasieu Parish FPD #1 (Moss Bluff)	Calcasieu		5	--

JURISDICTION	PARISH	POPULATION BASED ON 2000 CENSUS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES FIRE	POLICE
Calcasieu Parish FPD #2 *	Calcasieu		–	--
Central FPD #4 (Baton Rouge)	East Baton Rouge		10	--
Concordia F.P.D. #2 (Vidalia)	Concordia	4,543	1	--
Covington	St. Tammany	8,483	11	47
Crowley	Acadia	14,225	26	34
Denham Springs	Livingston	8,757	23	43
DeRidder	Beauregard	9,808	14	25
DeSoto Parish FPD #8 (Mansfield)	DeSoto	5,582	13	--
Donaldsonville	Ascension	7,605	13	--
East Baton Rouge Parish FPD #3 (BR)	East Baton Rouge		4	--
East Baton Rouge Parish FPD #5 (BR)	East Baton Rouge		1	--
East Baton Rouge Parish FPD #6 (BR)	East Baton Rouge		14	--
East Baton Rouge Parish FPD #9 (Alsen)	East Baton Rouge		1	--
Eunice	St. Landry	11,499	15	40
Franklin	St. Mary	8,354	7	29
Gonzales	Ascension	8,156	1	36
Grand Caillou F.P.D. #4A ***** (Houma)	Terrebonne		--	--
Hammond	Tangipahoa	17,639	55	103
Harahan	Jefferson	9,885	14	37
Houma	Terrebonne	32,393	53	81
Iberia Parish FPD #1 (New Iberia)	Iberia		6	--

JURISDICTION	PARISH	POPULATION BASED ON 2000 CENSUS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES	
			FIRE	POLICE
Jefferson Parish FPD (Metairie)	Jefferson		221	--
Jefferson Parish FPD #3 * (River Ridge)	Jefferson		--	--
Jennings	Jefferson Davis	10,986	16	41
Kenner	Jefferson	70,517	80	154
Lafayette	Lafayette	110,257	229	242
LaFourche Parish FPD #3	LaFourche		11	--
Lake Charles	Calcasieu	71,757	143	163
Leesville	Vernon	6,753	14	25
Lincoln FPD #1 (Vienna)	Lincoln	424	3	--
Livingston Parish FPD (Walker)	Livingston	4,801	5	--
Minden	Webster	13,027	14	33
Monroe	Ouachita	53,107	212	242
Morgan City	St. Mary	12,703	37	45
Natchitoches	Natchitoches	17,865	45	68
Natchitoches FPD #6 (Natchitoches)	Natchitoches		3	--
New Iberia	Iberia	32,623	62	79
Oakdale	Allen	8,137	3	27
Opelousas	St. Landry	22,860	50	74
Ouachita Parish FPD #1 (Monroe)	Ouachita		158	--
Pineville	Rapides	13,829	52	52
Plaquemine	Iberville	7,064	21	30
Pointe Coupee FPD #4 * (Livonia)	Pointe Coupee	1,339	--	--
Rapides Parish FPD #2 (Alexandria)	Rapides		49	--
Rapides FPD #3 (Tioga)	Rapides		4	--

JURISDICTION	PARISH	POPULATION BASED ON 2000 CENSUS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES	
			FIRE	POLICE
Rapides FPD #4 (Pineville)	Rapides		4	--
Rapides FPD #7 (Ruby-Kolin)	Rapides		2	--
Rayne	Acadia	8,552	--	19
Ruston	Lincoln	20,546	51	49
St. Bernard Parish FPD #1-2	St. Bernard		124	--
St. George FPD (Baton Rouge)	East Baton Rouge		95	--
St. John the Baptist FPD #2 ***** (LaPlace)	St. John the Baptist		--	--
St. Landry Parish FPD #1 (Krotz Springs)	St. Landry	1,219	8	--
St. Landry Parish FPD #2 (Port Barre)	St. Landry	2,287	7	--
St. Landry Parish FPD #3 (Opelousas)	St. Landry		35	--
St. Martinville	St. Martinville	6,989	--	24
St. Tammany Parish FPD #1 (Slidell)	St. Tammany	25,695	124	--
St. Tammany Parish FPD #2 (Madisonville)	St. Tammany	677	7	--
St. Tammany Parish FPD #3 (LaCombe)	St. Tammany		2	--
St. Tammany Parish FPD #4 (Mandeville)	St. Tammany	10,489	94	--
St. Tammany Parish FPD #7 ***** (Pearl River)	St. Tammany	1,839	--	--
St. Tammany Parish FPD #8 (Abita Springs)	St. Tammany	1,957	1	--
St. Tammany Parish FPD #11 ***** (Pearl River)	St. Tammany	1,839	--	--

JURISDICTION	PARISH	POPULATION BASED ON 2000 CENSUS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES	
			FIRE	POLICE
St. Tammany Parish FPD #12 (Covington)	St. Tammany		19	--
St. Tammany Parish FPD #13 * (Goodbee)	St. Tammany		--	--
Shreveport	Caddo	200,145	490	511
South Bossier FPD #2 * (Elmgrove)	Bossier		--	--
Sulphur	Calcasieu	20,512	51	64
Tangipahoa Parish FPD #1 (Amite)	Tangipahoa	4,110	9	--
Ville Platte	Evangeline	8,145	14	30
West Baton Rouge Parish FPD #1 * (Port Allen)	West Baton Rouge		–	--
West Baton Rouge Parish FPD #2 (Brusly)	West Baton Rouge	2,020	1	--
West Baton Rouge Parish FPD #4 * (Lobdell)	West Baton Rouge		--	--
West Feliciana FPD #1	St. Francisville		2	
West Monroe	Ouachita	13,250	32	74
Westwego	Jefferson	10,763	10	29
Winnfield	Winn	5,749	5	26
Zachary	East Baton Rouge	11,275	20	34
TOTALS			3,912	3,885
TOTAL FIRE AND POLICE EMPLOYEES			7,797	

***** These civil service boards have not been sworn in.

APPENDIX E

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART
FOR
OFFICE OF STATE EXAMINER

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
OFFICE OF STATE EXAMINER
MUNICIPAL FIRE & POLICE CIVIL SERVICE